1992

# Further Psychometric Properties of the Mother's Activity Checklist.

Linda Merideth Little
*Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College*

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road Ann Arbor MI 48106 1346 USA
313 761-4700 800 521-0600

Order Number 9302915

# Further psychometric properties of the mother's activity checklist

Little, Linda Merideth, Ph.D.

The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical Col., 1992



U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

# FURTHER PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF THE MOTHER'S ACTIVITY CHECKLIST

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Psychology

by
Linda M. Little
B.S., Tulane University, 1985
M.A., Louisiana State University, 1988
August 1992

Table of Contents

## Acknowledgments

I want to thank my husband and my family for all their support throughout seven years of graduate school and the dissertation process. I also want to thank my chairperson, Dr. Mary Lou Kelley, who has patiently guided me throughout this period and worked long hours helping me complete this project and many others. Many thanks also go to Dr. Joe Witt whose help in statistical analysis was invaluable in making this dissertation much more meaningful and useful overall. My appreciation also goes to all my committee members, Drs. June Tuma, Johnny Matson, Robert Coon, and Peter Simbi, for their hard work and helpful suggestions. Special thanks go to Dr. Lisa Moore who graciously agreed to be on my dissertation committee on very short notice.

Thanks also go to Dr. Ann Goodrich who provided me with a source for clinical subjects. I am also grateful to a large number of people who miraculously appeared just in time to answer burning questions or problems. These include everyone at LSU's Computer System User Services, the psychology departmental secretaries, Dr. Dave Blouin of the department of Experimental Statistics and fellow graduate students.

List of Tables

Abstract

The present study attempted to extend the results obtained by Kelley and Carper (1988) regarding the psychometric properties of the Mother's Activity Checklist utilizing a larger, more heterogeneous sample of mothers. The MAC is a 100-item checklist of pleasant and unpleasant setting events which mothers frequently experience. A revised version of the MAC consisting of 45 items was developed utilizing factor analysis procedures. The revised version consists of four factors: Pleasant Events, Unpleasant Events, Aversive Child Behavior, and Aversive Marital Events. Utilizing a sample of eight hundred and thirty-three mothers with children between the ages of 2 and 12, both the original 100-item MAC and the 45-item MAC were found to be highly internally consistent. Both original and revised MAC scores also were found to be excellent discriminators between clinical and nonclinical mothers. Relationships were also examined between MAC scores and measures of maternal depression, child behavior problems, marital adjustment, and major life stressors. Pleasant events scores were most closely related to maternal depression and marital adjustment with unpleasant events scores being correlated with maternal depression, child behavior problems, marital adjustment and major life stressors. Results suggest that the 100-item and 45-item MAC are equivalent across statistical procedures. The

revised version is therefore recommended as more efficient measure of maternal pleasant and unpleasant events.

## Introduction

Applied behavior analysis has been frequently utilized to produce changes in targeted behaviors such as children's noncompliance. In general, immediate antecedents and consequences of behaviors, that is temporally proximate events, have been the primary focus of many applied behavior analysis interventions. However, antecedents and consequences that occur in a more complex fashion, (i.e., in a temporally distant fashion) may also significantly affect behavior. These events may be termed setting events and were first described by Kantor (1959) as complex events which precede and overlap subsequent stimulus-response relationships. Setting events may be composed of both an environmental event and the person's response to that event (Bijou & Baer, 1961) and are often idiographic, with different stimulus-response relationships being important for different individuals (Wahler & Fox, 1981).

Bijou and Baer (1978) describe setting events as defining the context in which an event occurs. They explain the function of setting events as influencing " an interactional sequence by altering the strengths and characteristics of the particular stimulus and response functions involved in an interaction (p. 26)". Bijou and Baer identify a range of categories of different setting events which commonly affect interactions. These include physical or chemical events (i.e., temperature, noise-

level, etc.), organismic or biological events (i.e., satiation/deprivation, behavior dispositions, physical diseases, etc.), and social or cultural events (i.e., cultural situations, instructions, attitudes, etc.). Bijou and Baer indicate that all three types of setting events may overlap simultaneously to affect interactions.

Although the concept of setting events has been present since the late 1950's, the field of behavior therapy had not specifically addressed this issue until a series of studies were conducted by Wahler and his associates beginning in the early 1980's. Wahler's studies began to explore the effects of maternal insularity on the efficacy of behavioral interventions with mothers and their children. Maternal insularity was defined by Wahler as a combination of low-income status and low rates of interpersonal contact between the mother and her community. In addition, contacts that these mothers did experience were characterized as aversive interactions overall.

Wahler first became interested in maternal insularity through a study specifically investigating the effects of low-income status on the efficacy of traditional parent-training programs (Wahler, Leske & Rogers, 1979). Results showed that those mothers who failed to benefit from treatment reported low rates of reinforcing extrafamilial contacts and characterized contacts that they did have as aversive overall.

To further explore these findings, Wahler (1980) examined how insular mothers' behavior differed on days on which there was some type of reinforcing contact with friends (high friendship days) compared to days without such contact (low friendship days). Observational data collected in the home revealed that during baseline and follow-up phases of treatment, mothers' aversive behavior towards their children was significantly reduced on high friendship days. On days without contact with friends, both mothers' and children' behavior was significantly more aversive overall.

Wahler and Afton (1980) further added to the concept of insularity by examining the maintenance of treatment effects as well as changes in insular mothers' descriptions of their child's behavior following a parent-training program. Results indicated that although both insular and noninsular were equally effective in reducing their children's oppositional behavior during treatment, insular mothers failed to maintain these changes in follow-up. In addition, insular mothers continued to describe their children in negative and blaming styles despite observed improvements in the children's behavior.

Based on the findings of these studies, Wahler and Fox (1981) began to conceptualize maternal insularity as being best viewed as a setting event which significantly interacts with mothers' ability to benefit from treatment.

Wahler and Fox indicated that behavioral researchers had failed to consider the importance of such a concept despite the presence of the concept since 1959. In fact, the authors reviewed publications from the Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis and found very little reference to the concept of setting events at all. Research addressing this issue had focused on specific events such as the presence or absence of the experiment and not on more complex stimulus-response interactions. Wahler and Fox strongly urged the field of behavior analysis to broaden its perspective in regards to both the variables typically studied as well as the methods used to measure these variables. They recommended that more global concepts (such as insularity) should begin to be examined and that such concepts would best be measured through a range of techniques in addition to the traditional observational measurement techniques. Specifically, they recommended the inclusion of self-report data to examine a broader range of variables or setting events.

During the 1980's, researchers did begin to address more global issues and how they affected parents' abilities to benefit from traditional parent training procedures. Some of the most frequently examined global setting events include maternal depression, marital distress, and socioeconomic disadvantage. Review of these findings

reveals additional information about the impact of setting events on mother-child interactions.

Socioeconomic disadvantage has been frequently studied by many researchers although specific disadvantage variables measured differ widely. For example, socioeconomic disadvantage may be defined by a wide range of variables such as parental education, marital status, and socioeconomic status. Clark and Baker (1983) found that sociodemographic disadvantage significantly affected parental proficiency and completion of a parent training program. More specifically, those parents classified as less proficient were found to be of lower socioeconomic status, and the primary parent had significantly lower levels of education, expected more difficulties and had less previous behavior-modification experience. Parents classified as failing to follow-through with treatment were found to be more likely to be single, of lower socioeconomic and educational status, and have less prior exposure and more problems in teaching the skills. The authors concluded that for families experiencing socioeconomic disadvantage, different treatment programs may be warranted for a more successful outcome.

Webster-Stratton (1985) examined predictors of training outcome and found that a combination of socioeconomic disadvantage variables and negative life stress significantly predicted outcome. In general,

mothers who experienced high levels of disadvantage and life stress were more likely to fail to respond to training. However, the effects of life stress depended upon the outcome variables examined. On one treatment outcome criterion, mothers' reports of high levels of negative life experiences on the Life Experiences Survey significantly predicted treatment failure. On other criteria, mothers who responded to treatment reported greater amounts of negative life experiences, contrary to the researcher's expectations. However, responders also reported significantly more positive life experiences than nonresponders. Therefore, it appears necessary to assess not only variables which might limit maintenance, such as negative life experiences, but also variables which may help offset the detrimental effects, such as positive experiences.

Maternal depression also has been found to be related to the level of maternal participation such as completion of programs or involvement in follow-up phases. For example, in an examination of predictors of completion of a parent training program (Griest & Wells, 1983), it was found that depressed mothers were more likely to drop out of treatment than were nondepressed mothers. In addition, Griest, Forehand and Wells (1981) found that maternal depression was the best predictor of participation in follow-up assessment.

Interestingly, maternal depression did not predict treatment failure in Webster-Stratton's (1985) study. This finding was contrary to Webster-Stratton's expectations and it was suggested that this might have been a result of the high correlation of depression with socioeconomic disadvantage and negative life stress.

Studies examining the effects of marital distress on parent training outcome have obtained mixed results (Brody & Forehand (1985); Dadds, Sanders & James, 1987a; Dadds, Schwartz, & Sanders, 1987b; Oltmanns, Broderick, & O'Leary, 1977; Reisinger, Grangia & Hoffman, 1976). For example, no relationship was found between marital satisfaction and long-term treatment outcome by one study (Oltmanns et al., 1977). However, Brody and Forehand (1985) criticized the Oltmanns et al. (1977) study for failing to include an independent assessment of child and parent behaviors. Therefore, Brody et al. (1985) utilized a multimethod assessment package including measures of self-reported marital adjustment as well as independent observations of parent-child interactions to address this issue. They found that parent training was equally effective for both maritally distressed and nondistressed groups. However, follow-up data were not presented to support maintenance of these changes.

Other researchers, however, have found that marital distress significantly affected treatment outcome.

Reisinger et al. (1976) found that treatment maintenance was directly related to marital satisfaction. In addition, several studies found that training maritally distressed parents in a combination of parent training and spouse support training produced immediate and long term changes equal to those of nondistressed parents (Dadds et al., 1987a, 1987b). When offered only parent training, however, these families did not maintain treatment gains.

In summary, a wide range of studies have been conducted to examine major setting events such as socioeconomic disadvantage, maternal depression, and marital distress. However, researchers have failed to examine setting events which are more global than those targeted by observational data but still more specific than major setting events such as maternal depression. As a result, there exists a wide gap in our current understanding of the effects of setting events.

Review of measures available to researchers may provide a clue to the lack of research examining setting events. That is, while there are numerous measures available for major setting events, very few exist to measure minor setting events. For global variables such as maternal depression, major life stressors, and marital discord, commonly used measures include the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock & Erbaugh, 1961), the Life Experiences Survey (Saranson, Johnson, & Siegel,

1978), and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976). Fewer measures exist which assess more molecular setting events. Without assessment devices to measure setting events, researchers will perhaps continue to overlook such vital variables. In addition, clinicians who attempt to apply traditional treatment approaches applied without addressing existing setting events may continue to experience difficulties in achieving maintenance or generalization of treatment effects. Without identifying which families have special training needs, valuable time and effort may be spent unnecessarily.

Specific measures which do exist to measure minor setting events include the Pleasant Events Schedule (Lewinsohn & Libet, 1972) and the Unpleasant Events Schedule (Lewinsohn, 1975). These two measures specifically examine a range of pleasant and unpleasant events. These measures were developed to explore the relationship between depression and the frequency of pleasant and unpleasant events. Research utilizing these measures has found that depressed subjects reported experiencing fewer and less enjoyable pleasant activities than nondepressed subjects (Lewinsohn & Libet, 1972) as well as more frequent and aversive unpleasant events (Lewinsohn & Amenson, 1978). Both measures, however, contain items which were generated by college students. As

a result both measures fail to address specific issues that mothers specifically encounter.

Only four measures have been developed in an attempt to measure setting events which mothers specifically experience on a regular basis. These include the Family Crises Checklist (Patterson, 1982), the Community Interaction Checklist (Wahler, Leske & Rogers, 1979), the Parenting Daily Hassles scale (Crnic & Greenberg, 1990) and the Mother's Activity Checklist (Kelley & Carper, 1988).

The Family Crises Checklist (Patterson, 1982) was developed to measure the frequency of mother's daily aversive interpersonal and non-interpersonal experiences. The checklist assesses a variety of experiences, however its use is severely limited as no psychometric data is available on this instrument. In addition, it fails to identify positive experiences which mothers may experience.

The Community Interaction Checklist (CIC, Wahler et al., 1979) measures daily extrafamilial contacts and is administered in interview format. It questions mothers about specific characteristics of daily interactions such as the identify of the contact person, who initiated the contact, the valence of the contact, as well as the total number of hours for which the parent had direct caretaking responsibilities for the child. Use of the CIC is also limited as it offers no psychometric data to support its use.

The Parenting Daily Hassles scale (Crnic & Greenberg, 1990) was developed as part of a longitudinal study which examined the relationships between major life stress and minor parental daily hassles. This scale consists of 20 items measuring unpleasant events which are rated based on the frequency of occurrence and the intensity of the event. No information was provided by the authors on the scale development or analysis of items. Reliability estimates provided for the frequency and intensity scales are satisfactory.

The Mother's Activity Checklist (MAC) was developed by Kelley and Carper (1988) to provide an researchers with a more useful measure of a range of maternal setting events. The MAC is a 100-item self-report instrument which was designed to measure frequently occurring pleasant and unpleasant events commonly experienced by mothers.

The MAC was empirically derived through a multi-step process. First, mothers of a range of socioeconomic status levels and racial groups participated in an item generation study which defined 152 initial items. Second, a new set of mothers with similar racial and SES distribution rated the frequency and valence of each of the 152 items. Items which were found to be neutral and/or of low frequency were eliminated. One hundred items were then selected based on corrected item-total correlations. Internal consistency for both pleasant and unpleasant event scales was high.

Third, mothers with children between the ages of 2 and 12 were classified as either seeking clinical services for their child's behavior (clinical) or not seeking services (nonclinical). The MAC was found to reliably differentiate clinical mothers from nonclinical mothers. Fourth, preliminary construct validity data was obtained with the Beck Depression Inventory. BDI scores were found to be positively correlated with frequency of unpleasant events, and negatively correlated with frequency of pleasant events and valence of pleasant events.

To further examine the utility of the MAC, Carper (1988) investigated the relationship between the MAC, the CIC, and direct observations of mother-child interactions. Seven mother-child dyads were observed in their homes and measures of the aversive and positive behavior demonstrated by both children and their mothers were obtained. Results indicated that the MAC was the best predictor of aversive mother behavior, although the CIC was the best predictor of aversive child behavior. The authors indicated that when either the MAC or the CIC was used to classify days as negative or positive, significantly more aversive mother and child behaviors occurred on negative days versus positive days.

In review, the MAC offers several advantages over the Family Crises Checklist, the Community Interaction Checklist, and the Parenting Hassles scale. The most

important advantage is the inclusion of psychometric data regarding scale development and the MAC's reliability and validity. None of the alternative measures provide sufficient information on their psychometric properties to determine their reliability and validity. In comparison, preliminary data suggest that the MAC is internally consistent, is a good discriminator between mothers seeking services for their child's behavior problems, and has adequate construct validity with the BDI. In addition, the development of the MAC was based on data generated by actual mothers regarding frequent events that they consider to be pleasant or unpleasant. In contrast, items included on the FCC were generated by the test developers, not mothers and items may not necessarily be frequently occurring or relevant. Finally, the MAC also provides a more comprehensive method of identifying a wider range of both pleasant and unpleasant events, all of which may serve as setting events impacting upon the quality of parent-child relationship.

In summary, review of the setting event literature indicates that variables such as marital distress, maternal depression and major life stressors can adversely affect parent's abilities to benefit from behavioral intervention. There is growing support for more extensive examination of such variables in order to individualize treatment approaches to better meet the needs of parents. A wide

variety of measures currently exist to examine global setting events. However, fewer measures address more molecular setting events such as discrete events which mothers might experience.

The Mother's Activity Checklist is the only instrument available which measures a range of both pleasant and unpleasant events which mothers rate as occurring frequently. Preliminary psychometric data suggest that the MAC is a reliable and valid measure. However, at the present time, the MAC remains primarily a research instrument as further psychometric data with a larger, more heterogeneous population of mothers are needed to support its reliability. Descriptive data (i.e., means and standard deviations) are also needed in order to provide researchers with a means to interpret specific data on individual mothers.

In addition, although the MAC provides a comprehensive range of specific setting events, it requires a great deal of time for mothers to complete due to its length (100 items). Reducing the number of items without compromising the psychometric integrity of the MAC would provide researchers with a more efficient measure of setting events.

As both minor and major setting events have been identified by researchers as significantly affecting the quality of mother-child relationships as well as the

efficacy of interventions designed to improve these relationships, examination of the relationships between minor and major setting events could provide additional information about the underlying variables which contribute to treatment failure.

Finally, additional information is needed regarding how well the MAC discriminates between distressed and nondistressed mothers. Preliminary evidence suggests that the MAC does discriminate between mothers seeking services for their behavior problem child and mothers without behavior problem children. Confirmation of these findings with a new sample of clinical mothers as well as examination of differences between maritally distressed and nondistressed mothers as well as depressed and nondepressed mothers would provide additional support for the MAC's use.

The present study attempted to address these needs by examining the following issues:

Purpose 1. The reliability of the MAC was examined utilizing a larger, more heterogeneous population of mothers, in order to provide additional support for the internal consistency of the MAC.

Purpose 2. It was examined whether an abbreviated version could be obtained, based on item analysis and factor analysis procedures, without compromising the psychometric integrity achieved with a longer form.

Purpose 3. In order to provide a means of comparison for individual mother's MAC scores, descriptive data (i.e., means and standard deviations) for original and revised MAC scores were calculated utilizing a heterogeneous sample of mothers. Demographic differences between groups on MAC scores were also examined.

Purpose 4. The relationships between the MAC and other commonly utilized measures of major setting events (including maternal depression, marital distress and major life events) were examined.

Purpose 5. In order to provide further evidence for the MAC's ability to discriminate clinically distressed mothers and nondistressed mothers, differences in means across mothers seeking services for their noncompliant child as well as marital distressed mothers and depressed mothers were examined. To further explore significant findings between distressed groups, rates of depression, marital discord, and child behavior problems were evaluated to determine whether differences existed between distressed mothers and nondistressed mothers on supplemental measures. The MAC's ability to accurately classify mothers into distressed or nondistressed groups was also evaluated.

## Method

### Subjects

The sample consisted of 833 mothers with children between the ages of 2 and 12. Mothers were recruited from a wide variety of sources including pediatrician's offices, psychology outpatient clinics, child care centers, and private social service agencies. In addition, subjects were also recruited from undergraduate psychology classes. As seen in Table 1, the breakdown of racial groupings is representative of national percentages (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990) as are income groupings. The majority of subjects were white (81%) and married (76%) with income levels ranging from under $5,000 to over $50,000.

### Measures

Demographic Questionnaire. A brief questionnaire was completed to obtain information on socioeconomic status, marital status, and other demographic characteristics.

Mother's Activity Checklist (MAC). The MAC is a 100-item checklist that assesses the frequency and intensity of pleasant and unpleasant events (Kelley & Carper, 1988). The MAC consists of 50 pleasant and 50 unpleasant items which are rated whether the respondent experienced the event during a two week period. Frequency and valence ratings are obtained on both the pleasant items and the unpleasant items, yielding four subscores. (See Appendix A).

Table 1

Demographic Information

| Variable | n | Percent | National Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Socioeconomic status | | | |
| Level 1 | 207 | 26 | |
| Level 2 | 198 | 25 | |
| Level 3 | 191 | 24 | |
| Level 4 | 202 | 25 | |
| Race | | | |
| White | 678 | 81 | 84 |
| Black | 136 | 16 | 12 |
| Other | 19 | 2 | 3 |
| Income | | | |
| $0.00 to 4,999 | 38 | 5 | 6 |
| $5,000 to 9,999 | 40 | 5 | 11 |
| $10,000 to 14,999 | 56 | 7 | 10 |
| $15,000 to 24,999 | 131 | 16 | 19 |
| $25,000 to 34,999 | 158 | 19 | 16 |
| $35,000 to 49,000 | 160 | 19 | 17 |
| $50,000 or above | 224 | 27 | 21 |

Table 1 (cont.)

| Variable | n | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Marital status | | |
| Married | 636 | 76 |
| Divorced | 84 | 10 |
| Separated | 44 | 5 |
| Living with Someone | 20 | 2 |
| Other | 49 | 6 |
| Maternal education | | |
| Less than high school | 34 | 4 |
| Completed high school | 182 | 22 |
| Some college | 347 | 42 |
| Completed college | 197 | 23 |
| Graduate/professional training | 71 | 9 |
| Distressed group | | |
| Child Clinical | 45 | 5 |
| Marital Clinical | 15 | 2 |
| High Depression | 42 | 5 |

Beck Depression Inventory. The BDI (Beck et al., 1961) is a 21-item self-report of depression which has demonstrated adequate reliability and validity data (Metcalfe & Goldman, 1965, Williams, Barlow, & Agras, 1972).

Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS). The DAS (Spanier, 1976) is a 32-item questionnaire which evaluates general marital satisfaction. Adequate internal consistency, criterion-related validity, and construct validity have been demonstrated.

Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory. The Eyberg is a behavioral checklist consisting of 36 items representing common problems reported by parents. The Eyberg yields two scores: an Intensity Scale score and Problem Scale score. The Eyberg has been found to discriminate between clinical and nonclinical families (Eyberg & Ross, 1978). Split-half correlations, test-retest correlations and internal consistency coefficients are satisfactory for both scales (Robinson, Eyberg, & Ross, 1980).

Life Experiences Survey (LES). The LES (Saranson et al., 1978) is a self report scale measuring major life events which lists 47 stressors. Mothers were asked to indicate which events occurred during the last year, and the impact of each event based on a 7 point Likert scale ranging from extremely negative (-3) to extremely positive (+3). Four scores were obtained including 1) the number of

events endorsed as occurring, 2) a positive impact score or the sum of the positive weightings, 3) a negative impact score or sum of the negative weightings and 4) a total change score or the sum of the positive and negative weightings.

Reliability and validity on the LES are adequate. Test-retest reliabilities on the negative impact score have been shown to be satisfactory ($r$ = .88). In addition, significant correlations have been found with measures of depression, academic problems and state/trait anxiety.

Procedure

All mothers who agreed to participate in the study were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire, the MAC and the Eyberg Child Behavior Inventory. Mothers who were seeking psychological services were asked to also complete the Beck Depression Inventory, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, and the Life Experiences Survey. Mothers recruited from undergraduate psychology classes were also asked to complete the full set of questionnaires. Measures were presented in random order so as to control for order effects. Mothers were informed of the purpose of the present project and written consent for their participation was obtained.

## Results

### Internal Structure of the MAC

The internal consistencies of MAC frequency scores (pleasant and unpleasant) were determined using Cronbach's alpha. Reliabilities equalled .90 for both scores. Item-total correlations ranged from .19 to .61 for the frequency of pleasant events and .19 to .53 for the frequency of unpleasant events.

Items were then evaluated to determine whether they met the criteria for inclusion utilized by Kelley and Carper (1988). Criteria include a frequency of 2.0 for pleasant items and a frequency of 1.35 for unpleasant items. Four pleasant items (25, 37, 41, 47) and one unpleasant item (44) failed to meet this inclusion criterion. In addition, item valences were examined to determine whether they retained the valence direction from the original study. That is, pleasant items' valences must have been greater than five and unpleasant items' valences less than three. One pleasant item (37) and four unpleasant items (26, 33, 44, 76) failed to meet this criterion. Corrected item-total correlations were then examined and 11 items were identified with correlations less than .30 (Items 4, 9, 10, 22, 28, 29, 30, 32, 44, 64, 68). In summary, 18 items were identified as failing to meet inclusion criteria on one or more of the above categories and were eliminated from further analyses.

A principal components factor analysis was then conducted with the remaining 82 items to determine the MAC's factor structure. Using a varimax procedure, 10 factors with eigenvalues greater than one were identified. Based on review of the eigenvalues and a scree test, it appeared that a four factor solution was the most appropriate factor structure. Using simple structure criteria, items with factor loadings less than .40 or which had high loadings on two factors were then eliminated (See Appendix B for a copy of the Revised Mother's Activity Checklist). The final factor structure contained 45 items and accounted for 36% of the variance. Appendix C presents the factor loadings for each item retained. Appendices D and E present information on the item-total correlations, means and standard deviations for each item included on the original and new measure.

Review of the content of items for each factor indicated that Factor 1 measured pleasant events (e.g., #77, Having a good conversation; #38, Spending time with friends). Factor 2 assessed negative child behavior (e.g. #69, Having my child disobey me; #61, Having my child not cooperate with something s/he has to do). Factor 3 measured aversive marital events (e.g., #96, Being criticized or nagged by my spouse; #99, Being taken for granted by my spouse). Items associated with Factor 4 reflected unpleasant events (e.g., #94, Having too much to

do; #34, Being late or having to rush). Therefore the factors were named: Pleasant Events, Aversive Child Behavior, Aversive Marital Events and Unpleasant Events.

Reliability estimates were then computed for the four new MAC factors. Because each factor had significantly fewer items than the original variables (which consisted of 50 items), reliability estimates were somewhat lower but still high for factor scores. Alphas ranged from a high of .86 on the Pleasant Events factor (24 items, item-total correlations ranged from .33 to .61) to a low of .71 for the Unpleasant Events factor (8 items, item-total correlations ranged from .32 to .52). The Aversive Child Behavior factor consisted of 7 items and had a reliability of .81 (item-total correlation ranged from .45 to .68). The Aversive Marital Events factor consisted of 6 items with a reliability of .81 (item-total correlation ranged from .44 to .67).

In summary, a principal components factor analysis identified four factors which together consisted of 45 items from the original list of 100 items. Internal consistency estimates computed on each factor revealed relatively high reliabilities.

Descriptive Information on the MAC

A goal of the present study was to obtain information on MAC scores across a wide cross-section of the population. Descriptive information (i.e., means and

standard deviations) for the four original and four new MAC scores is presented in Table 2. Table 3 presents descriptive data on MAC scores based on mean scores (i.e., total score divided by the number of items for each variable).

Demographic Differences

Univariate analyses of variance were conducted to examine whether there were significant differences among demographic groups' scores for both the MAC original scores and new factors.

Ratings of socioeconomic status were computed for each subject based on Hollingshead's two factor theory (Hollingshead & Redlich, 1956), which utilizes parental level of education and occupational status. As this yields scores on a continuum, SES ratings were grouped into quartiles to facilitate analyses. For the original MAC scores, univariate analyses of variance revealed that only the valence of pleasant events had a significant main effect [$F(3, 794) = 7.05$, $p < .0001$]. Post hoc comparisons using Scheffe's procedure revealed that mothers in the lowest SES group rated pleasant events as less enjoyable than those mothers in the two highest groups (See Appendix F for means). No differences between SES groups on the new factors were identified.

Table 2

Descriptive Data on Mother's Activity Checklist

| Variable | M | SD |
|---|---|---|
| Original MAC Scores | | |
| Frequency of Pleasant Events | 137.48 | 24.07 |
| Frequency of Unpleasant Events | 103.09 | 21.55 |
| Valence of Pleasant Events | 242.39 | 43.29 |
| Valence of Unpleasant Events | 75.83 | 25.51 |
| New MAC Factors | | |
| Pleasant Events | 70.94 | 12.59 |
| Aversive Child Behavior | 18.60 | 5.78 |
| Aversive Marital Events | 12.38 | 4.63 |
| Unpleasant Events | 20.06 | 5.10 |

Table 3

Descriptive Data on Mean Scores on the Mother's Activity Checklist

| Variable | n | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| Original MAC Scores | | | |
| Frequency of Pleasant Events | 50 | 2.74 | .48 |
| Frequency of Unpleasant Events | 50 | 2.06 | .43 |
| Valence of Pleasant Events | 50 | 4.84 | .86 |
| Valence of Unpleasant Events | 50 | 1.51 | .51 |
| New MAC Factors | | | |
| Pleasant Events | 24 | 2.95 | .52 |
| Aversive Child Behavior | 7 | 2.65 | .82 |
| Aversive Marital Events | 6 | 2.06 | .77 |
| Unpleasant Events | 8 | 2.50 | .63 |

To further explore the limited differences in MAC scores for socioeconomic status, maternal occupation and education were separately analyzed. For maternal occupation, a significant effect was found only for the valence of unpleasant events [$F(8, 638) = 2.79$, $p < .005$]. However, significant differences between groups were not identified with a Scheffe's post hoc comparison of means.

Significant differences were found for both original and new MAC scores across the five maternal education levels. For original scores, mothers with a less than high school education rated unpleasant events as occurring more frequently than mothers with a high school degree or a professional degree [$F(4, 823) = 3.47$, $p < .008$] and rated pleasant events as less enjoyable than all other mothers [$F(4, 823) = 6.31$, $p < .0001$]. Mothers who had less than a high school degree rated unpleasant events as more aversive than mothers with a high school education [$F(4, 823) = 5.11$, $p < .0005$]. While a significant main effect was found for the frequency of pleasant events [$F(4, 823) = 2.68$, $p < .03$], no differences in mean scores were found using a Scheffe's post hoc comparison (See Appendix G for means). For new factors, mothers with some high school rated unpleasant events as occurring more frequently [$F(4, 823) = 2.85$, $p < .02$] than mothers with a high school degree. Mothers with some high school rated more frequent aversive child behaviors than mothers with a high school

degree, some college or graduate training [$F(4, 823) = 4.54$, $p < .001$] (See Appendix H for means).

Analyses of variance across the seven income levels for the original MAC variables indicated that only the frequency of pleasant events [$F(6, 800) = 4.00$, $p < .0006$] and valence of pleasant events [$F(6, 800) = 13.09$, $p < .0001$] had significant main effects. Subsequent Scheffe's post-hoc comparisons revealed that significant differences occurred only for the valence of pleasant events. Mothers in the lowest income level ($0 to $4,999) rated pleasant events as less enjoyable than mothers from the three highest income levels ($25,000 to over $75,000). Mothers of the second and third lowest income levels ($5,000 to $14,999) rated lower pleasant valences than those of the highest two income levels ($35,000 to over $75,000) (See Appendix I for means). For the new factors, a significant main effect for income was found only for the Aversive Marital Events factor [$F(6, 628) = 2.97$, $p < .007$]. Mothers with incomes between $15,000 and $24,999 reported more frequent aversive marital events than mothers with incomes between $35,000 and $50,000 (See Appendix J for means).

Significant differences were found for both original and new MAC scores between black and white mothers. For the original scores, analyses of variance revealed significant main effects for the frequency of unpleasant

events [$F(1, 812) = 5.84$, $p < .02$] and valence of pleasant events [$F(1, 812) = 11.65$, $p < .0007$]. Comparison of means reveals that black mothers rated unpleasant events as occurring less frequently and pleasant events as being less enjoyable (See Appendix K for means). For the new factors, analyses of variance revealed significant main effects for the Pleasant Events factor [$F(1, 812) = 13.52$, $p < .0003$], the Unpleasant Events factor [$F(1, 812) = 4.23$, $p < .04$], and the Aversive Child Behavior factor [$F(1, 812) = 8.04$, $p < .004$]. Black mothers rated unpleasant events and aversive child behavior as occurring less frequently than white mothers, while rating pleasant events as occurring more frequently (See Appendix L for means).

Univariate analyses of variance across the five marital status groups revealed significant main effects for all four original MAC variables: the frequency of pleasant events [$F(4, 828) = 16.36$, $p < .0001$], the frequency of unpleasant events [$F(4, 828) = 11.17$, $p < .0001$], the valence of pleasant events [$F(4, 828) = 27.01$, $p < .0001$], and the valence of unpleasant events [$F(4, 828) = 2.86$, $p < .02$]. Subsequent Scheffe's post hoc comparison of means revealed that mothers who were single, divorced, or separated rated pleasant events as occurring less frequently and being less enjoyable than mothers who were married or living with a boyfriend. Single, divorced, or separated mothers also rated unpleasant events as occurring

less frequently than married mothers (See Appendix M for means). For the new factors, a significant difference was noted only for the Pleasant Events Factor [$F(4, 828) = 2.44$, $p < .04$]. No differences between groups were noted using a Scheffe's post hoc comparison.

In summary, comparison of scores on original MAC scores across demographic variables yielded significant differences in scores on original MAC scores across several groups. More specifically, the valence of pleasant events was the only score identified as significantly different across SES groups, maternal education, income levels, racial groups, and marital status, while no differences across groups were found for the valence of unpleasant events. The frequency of unpleasant events was significantly different across race, maternal education and marital status, while the frequency of pleasant events was different only for marital status. Comparison of demographic groups' scores on the new factors indicates that significant differences were found between racial and income groups and between maternal education levels.

Construct Validity

Pearson product moment correlations were conducted to explore relationships between the MAC (a measure of molecular setting events) and the BDI, the Eyberg Intensity and Problems scores, the DAS, and the LES (measures of global setting events). Correlations were computed to

examine both the MAC's convergent validity properties (relationships with measures of similar constructs) and discriminant validity properties (relationships with measures of dissimilar constructs).

Original MAC scores. Correlations between the original MAC scores and the supplemental measures are shown in Table 4. As correlations with supplemental measures were similar overall for both the frequency and valence of pleasant events scores, they will be discussed together. Both scores were inversely related to maternal depression (BDI) and ratings of the impact of negative major life events (LES3), and directly related to marital adjustment (DAS). Small but significant correlations were observed with the impact of positive major life events (LES2). The previous correlations provide moderate support for the MAC's convergent validity. Low correlations were found with measures of aversive child behavior (E1 and E2), the number major life stressors (LES1) and the total impact of the stressors (LES4) suggesting the original pleasant MAC scores may demonstrate discriminant validity.

For the frequency of unpleasant events, support was found for convergent validity by significant correlations with all supplemental questionnaires which measured aversive events. The frequency of unpleasant events was most closely related to child behavior problems (E1, $r$ = .49). In addition, it was negatively correlated with

Table 4

Pearson Correlations Between the Original MAC Variables and Supplemental Measures

| Measure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. FPOS | - | .65** | .15** | .21** | -.34** | -.14** | -.19** | .39** | -.08 | .15** | -.21** | -.07 |
| 2. VPOS | | - | -.00 | .15** | -.37** | -.15** | -.11* | .35** | -.13 | .14 | -.28** | -.13 |
| 3. FNEG | | | - | .40** | .37** | .49** | .37** | -.30** | .28** | .03 | .33** | .28** |
| 4. VNEG | | | | - | -.00 | .11* | .05 | -.10 | .06 | .09 | .03 | .03 |
| 5. BDI | | | | | - | .28** | .26** | -.45** | .35** | -.08 | .53** | .37** |
| 6. E1 | | | | | | - | .66** | -.20** | .20** | .01 | .26** | .22** |
| 7. E2 | | | | | | | - | -.21** | .14 | -.03 | .21** | .15* |
| 8. DAS | | | | | | | | - | -.31** | .04 | -.44** | -.32** |
| 9. LES1 | | | | | | | | | - | .53** | .75** | .93** |
| 10. LES2 | | | | | | | | | | - | -.01 | .60** |
| 11. LES3 | | | | | | | | | | | - | .78** |
| 12. LES4 | | | | | | | | | | | | - |

Note: *p < .0031. **p<.0001

marital adjustment (DAS) and positively correlated with all supplemental measures other than the LES positive changescore (LES2). The lack of correlation with the LES positive change score suggests discriminant validity.

The only statistically significant correlation for the valence of unpleasant events was with Eyberg Intensity scores (E1, $r$ = .11, $p<.001$), which is still very low. Convergent and discriminant validity are not supported for the valence of unpleasant events.

New factors. Table 5 presents correlations for the new factors. Convergent validity for the Aversive Marital Events factor was most clearly demonstrated by substantial correlations with marital adjustment (DAS scores, $r$ = -.66). The Aversive Marital Events factor also was directly related to maternal depression (BDI), child behavior problems (E1 and E2), the number of life events (LES1), the negative effect of life events (LES3), and the total effect of life events (LES4). Little correlation was found with the LES positive change score (LES2).

The Aversive Child Behavior factor also demonstrated high convergent validity. High correlations were found with both Eyberg scores (E1, $r$ = .60; E2, $r$ = .42). Modest correlations were seen with the negative impact of life experiences (LES3) and maternal depression (BDI) as well. Low correlations were identified with marital adjustment

Table 5

Pearson Correlations Between the New MAC Factors and Supplemental Measures

| Measure | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Pleas | - | .05 | .03 | .03 | -.29** | -.15** | -.19** | .25** | .01 | .18** | -.10 | .03 |
| 2. Unpl | | - | .34** | .33** | .36** | .27** | .22** | -.18** | .24** | .04 | .30** | .26** |
| 3. Mar | | | - | .37** | .37** | .29** | .25** | -.66** | .30** | .01 | .36** | .28** |
| 4. Child | | | | - | .25** | .60** | .42** | -.14 | .16* | -.01 | .21** | .16** |
| 5. BDI | | | | | - | .28** | .26** | -.45** | .35** | -.08 | .53** | .37** |
| 6. E1 | | | | | | - | .66** | -.20** | .20** | .01 | .26** | .22** |
| 7. E2 | | | | | | | - | -.21** | .14 | -.03 | .21** | .15* |
| 8. DAS | | | | | | | | - | -.31** | .04 | -.44** | -.32** |
| 9. LES1 | | | | | | | | | - | .53** | .75** | .93** |
| 10. LES2 | | | | | | | | | | - | -.01 | .60** |
| 11. LES3 | | | | | | | | | | | - | .78** |
| 12. LES4 | | | | | | | | | | | | - |

Note: *p < .0031. **p<.0001

(DAS), the number of major life experiences (LES1), the positive impact of life experiences (LES2), and the total impact of life experiences (LES4) suggesting discriminant validity.

The Pleasant Events factor was inversely related to depression and directly related to marital adjustment. Modest correlations were found with the Life Events Survey's positive change score (LES2). However, this was the highest correlation found between LES2 and any other measure besides LES subscores. Low correlations were identified for those supplemental questionnaires which measured aversive events, such as Eyberg scores, and LES scores other than the positive change score. These low correlations suggest discriminant validity.

For the Unpleasant Events factor, highest correlations were found with depression and the negative impact of life experiences. The factor was also directly related to child behavior problems (Eyberg), and Life Event Survey scores (other than the positive impact score) while negatively related to marital adjustment (DAS). The presence of significant correlations with measures of aversive events and lack of correlation with a measure of the impact of positive events (LES2) suggests convergent and discriminant validity.

In summary, results suggest that both the original and new MAC scores and factors demonstrate construct validity.

Support is most clearly seen for the new MAC factors due to higher correlations with measures of marital and child behaviors. Convergent validity estimates for pleasant events scores for both original and new MAC are similar overall. That is, for both the new and original pleasant events factors, the highest correlations were found with depression and marital adjustment. Modest correlations were also found with the LES positive change score (LES2). For the original and new frequency of unpleasant events scales, all correlations were virtually identical, other than those for child behavior and marital adjustment variables.

Effects of Clinical Status on MAC Scores

Univariate analyses of variance were utilized to examine how well the MAC scores differentiated between clinical and nonclinical status. Two separate types of clinical status were measured: child clinical status and marital clinical status. In order to qualify for child clinical status, the mother must have been seeking treatment for the child and rated her child within the clinical ranges on both Eyberg scales (Robinson et al., 1980). For marital clinical status, the mother must have been seeking treatment for marital problems and have clinically significant DAS scores. Appendices N and O present means across clinical status.

Clinical Status. For original MAC scores, analyses of variance revealed that the frequency of unpleasant events [$F(1, 569) = 62.89$, $p < .0001$], the valence of pleasant events [$F(1, 569) = 9.78$, $p < .002$], and the frequency of pleasant events [$F(1, 569) = 5.48$, $p < .02$] all demonstrated significant main effects for child clinical status. For marital clinical status, main effects were found for the frequency of pleasant events [$F(1, 141) = 24.46$, $p < .0001$], and the valence of pleasant events [$F(1, 141) = 8.93$, $p < .003$]. Post hoc comparison of means revealed that for both child and marital clinical status groups, pleasant events were rated as occurring less frequently and as less pleasant than nonclinical mothers. However, mothers in the child clinical status group also rated unpleasant events as occurring more frequently than nonclinical mothers.

For the new factors, analyses of variance indicated main effects for all four factors for child clinical status. The Aversive Child Behavior factor [$F(1, 569) = 97.88$, $p < .0001$] demonstrated the strongest effect, followed by the Unpleasant Events factor [$F(1, 569) = 20.12$, $p < .0001$], the Pleasant Events factor [$F(1, 569) = 6.12$, $p < .01$], and the Aversive Marital Events factor [$F(1, 448) = 4.71$, $p < .03$]. For the marital clinical group, analyses of variance indicated that the Aversive Marital Events factor [$F(1, 136) = 22.21$, $p < .0001$] and

the Pleasant Events factor [$F(1, 141) = 15.16$, $p < .0002$] had significant main effects. Comparison of means indicated that for both the child and marital clinical groups, the frequency of aversive marital events was higher and pleasant events was lower than for nondistressed mothers. In addition, those mothers from the child clinical group also rated the frequency of unpleasant events and aversive child behavior as higher than for the nonclinical group.

Depression. Additional analyses of variance were conducted to examine whether the MAC scores were able to differentiate between depressed mothers and nondepressed mothers. Subjects were classified into high depression (BDI score of over 19) and low depression groups (BDI score of 9 or less). Appendices S and T present means for depression groups.

On original variables, analyses of variance indicated significant main effects for the valence of pleasant events [$F(1, 405) = 49.98$, $p < .0001$], the frequency of unpleasant events [$F(1, 405) = 43.15$, $p < .0001$], and the frequency of pleasant events [$F(1, 405) = 31.04$, $p < .0001$]. Comparison of means reveals that highly depressed mothers endorsed experiencing fewer pleasant events and more unpleasant events, with pleasant events being rated less enjoyable.

For the new factors, analyses of variance indicated significant main effects for level of depression on the

Unpleasant Events factor [$F(1, 405) = 37.74$, $p < .0001$], the Aversive Marital Events factor [$F(1, 312) = 33.36$, $p < .0001$], the Pleasant Events factor [$F(1, 405) = 18.22$, $p < .0001$] and the Aversive Child Behavior factor [$F(1, 405) = 17.69$, $p < .0001$]. Depressed mothers indicated that they experienced fewer pleasant events and more unpleasant events, more aversive marital events and more aversive child behavior than nondepressed mothers.

To further explore these findings, univariate analyses of variance were performed to examine whether significantly higher child behavior problems, marital distress, or maternal depression was indicated in the three distressed groups based on supplemental measures (i.e., Eyberg, DAS, BDI).

Higher rates of perceived child behavior problems were found for depressed mothers [E1, $F(1, 405) = 28.53$, $p < .0001$; E2, $F(1, 405) = 20.84$, $p < .0001$] compared to nondepressed mothers. Marital clinical mothers rated only the Eyberg problem score [$F(1, 141) = 5.18$, $p < .02$] as higher than nonclinical mothers.

Significantly more marital distress was identified for depressed mothers [$F(1, 270) = 46.87$, $p < .0001$] when compared to nondepressed mothers, however, no differences between child clinical and nonclinical mothers were found.

Both child clinical [$F(1, 371) = 10.95$, $p < .001$] and marital clinical mothers [$F(1, 141) = 42.69$, $p < .0001$]

were found to have significantly higher BDI scores than did nonclinical mothers.

Discriminant Analyses

To provide additional information on how well the MAC scores classified subjects into clinical and nonclinical groups, discriminant analyses were conducted for both child clinical and marital clinical status using MAC scores. In addition, analyses were conducted upon high and low maternal depression groups to determine how well scores classified depressed and nondepressed mothers.

Child Clinical Status. A stepwise discriminant analysis was performed to determine how accurate the original MAC variables were in classifying subjects by child clinical status. The frequency of unpleasant events, frequency of pleasant events, and the valence of unpleasant events together correctly classified 79% of the classification of subjects by child clinical status (Wilks's =.60, $p < .0001$). When examining the new MAC factors using a stepwise discriminant analysis, the Aversive Child Behavior factor, the Unpleasant Events factor, and the Pleasant Events factor together were able to correctly classify child clinical membership 79% of the time (Wilks's = .60, $p < .0001$). Table 6 presents the classification matrices for child clinical status.

Table 6

Classification by Child Clinical Status

Original Variables

| Group | n | Predicted Group Membership | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 |
| Child Clinical | 45 | 34<br>76% | 11<br>24% |
| Child Nonclinical | 45 | 8<br>18% | 37<br>82% |

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 79%

New Factors

| Group | n | Predicted Group Membership | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 |
| Child Clinical | 45 | 32<br>71% | 13<br>29% |
| Child Nonclinical | 45 | 6<br>13% | 39<br>87% |

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 79%

Direct discriminant analyses were conducted on each of the additional questionnaires with child clinical status to compare classification rates with those found with MAC scores. No other questionnaire was able to accurately predict child clinical status.

Marital Clinical Status. A stepwise discriminant analysis was then performed to determine how accurate the original MAC variables were in classifying subjects based on marital clinical status. The frequency of pleasant events, the valence of unpleasant events, and the frequency of unpleasant events together correctly classified 93% of the subjects (Wilks's = .39, $p < .0001$). For the new MAC factors, the Pleasant Events and the Aversive Marital Events factors together accurately classified 88% of subjects (Wilks's =.49, $p < .0003$). Table 7 presents the classification matrices for marital clinical status.

Direct discriminant analyses were conducted on each of the additional questionnaires. All supplemental questionnaires other than the LES positive change score and the Eyberg Intensity score were able to significantly classify subjects by marital clinical status. Accuracy rates ranged from 77% (LES3 - negative change score) to 65% (LES1 - total number of events).

Depression. A final set of discriminant analysis procedures were performed to examine how accurately MAC

Table 7

Classification by Marital Clinical Status

Original Variables

| Group | n | Predicted Group Membership | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 |
| Marital Clinical | 15 | 15<br>100% | 0<br>0% |
| Marital Nonclinical | 15 | 2<br>13% | 13<br>87% |

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 93%

New Factors

| Group | n | Predicted Group Membership | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 |
| Marital Clinical | 11 | 10<br>91% | 1<br>9% |
| Marital Nonclinical | 15 | 2<br>13% | 13<br>87% |

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 88%

scores classified subjects by level of depression. High and low depression groups discussed earlier in the analyses of variance were utilized.

For original MAC scores, a stepwise procedure revealed that the frequency of unpleasant events, the valence of pleasant events, and the valence of unpleasant events combined to accurately classify 90% of the subjects (Wilks's = .43, $p < .0001$). For the new MAC factors, the Aversive Marital Events, Unpleasant Events, Pleasant Events and Aversive Child Behavior factors combined to accurately classify 88% of the subjects into high or low depression groups using a stepwise procedure (Wilks's = .49, $p < .0001$). Table 8 presents the classification matrices for maternal depression.

Direct discriminant analyses were also conducted on each of the supplemental questionnaires. Accuracy rates ranged from 80% for the DAS to 69% for the Life Events Survey total impact score (LES4) and the Life Events Survey number of life events (LES1).

In summary, both original scores and new factors classified subjects at least a 79% accuracy rate across all three discriminant analyses procedures (clinical child, clinical marital, and maternal depression). Both also classified subjects more accurately than all other supplemental questionnaires except those upon which group classification was dependent.

Table 8

Classification by Maternal Depression

Original variables

| Group | n | Predicted Group Membership | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 |
| High Depression | 42 | 39<br>93% | 3<br>7% |
| Low Depression | 42 | 5<br>12% | 37<br>88% |

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 90%

New Factors

| Group | n | Predicted Group Membership | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1 | 2 |
| High Depression | 33 | 31<br>94% | 2<br>6% |
| Low Depression | 24 | 5<br>21% | 19<br>79% |

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 88%

## Discussion

Setting events have been identified as important variables which affect not only mother-child interactions but also behavioral interventions designed to improve these interactions. The Mother's Activity Checklist was developed by Kelley and Carper (1988) to provide researchers with a measure other than the Family Crises Checklist, the Community Interaction Checklist, or the Parenting Daily Hassles scale to assess maternal setting events. Preliminary psychometric data obtained by Kelley and Carper (1988) suggested that the MAC was a potentially useful scale which might provide additional data to the clinician about a range of ongoing setting events which might impede treatment effects and/or the generalizability of such effects.

The present study's overall purpose was to provide additional support for the use of the MAC through examination of the MAC's psychometric properties with a larger, more heterogeneous sample of mothers as well as with additional clinical subgroups. One particular goal was to examine the internal consistency of the MAC based on this more heterogeneous sample of mothers. Results obtained suggest that the MAC is a highly internal consistent measure, supporting findings by Kelley and Carper (1988).

Another goal of the present study was to provide a shorter measure of pleasant and unpleasant events without sacrificing the psychometric integrity of the original MAC. Utilizing item analysis and factor analysis procedures, a revised version of the MAC was developed. The revised version consists of 45 items which were grouped into four factors: Pleasant Events, Aversive Child Behavior, Aversive Marital Events and Unpleasant Events. Examination of the reliability of the revised version reveals that all factors are internally consistent.

In order to provide researchers with a specific means to compare individual's MAC scores, descriptive information is provided for both original and new MAC scores. MAC scores were also analyzed to examine whether specific differences existed between demographic groups. Univariate analyses indicated that, for original MAC scores, differences were found across SES groups, maternal education, income levels, racial groups, and marital status. For the new factors, differences were found only between racial groups and between levels of maternal education. These results suggest that the new MAC might be a more clinically useful measure. That is, as the MAC was developed to provide clinicians a means to examine specific setting events which might affect clinical intervention, having fewer differences across demographic groups may allow scores to be interpreted more clearly.

Relationships between the MAC and commonly utilized measures of major setting events (BDI, Eyberg, DAS, LES) also were examined. Results indicate that relationships between supplemental measures and the new MAC (on the pleasant and unpleasant events scales) are very similar to those achieved with the original MAC. This supports the use of the new MAC as no information appears to be sacrificed through the use of a shortened version. In addition, the new MAC marital and child factors were highly related to measures of marital adjustment and child behavior problems suggesting that the new MAC offers information beyond that which was easily available with the longer version.

Examination of specific relationships with supplemental measures for the pleasant and unpleasant events scores provides clues to the underlying variables that each factor measures. Review of correlations indicates that both the frequency and valence of pleasant events scores were most closely associated with maternal depression supporting similar findings obtained by Bouman and Lutejin (1986) in their research examining the Pleasant Events Schedule. Pleasant events in the present study were also significantly correlated with marital adjustment. Although no other research has specifically examined this relationship, Wahler's (1986) findings that the quality of mothers' interpersonal relationships can affect subsequent

interactions with her child provide support for the hypothesis that these same relationships could affect marital adjustment as well.

Review of relationships found with the frequency of unpleasant events also indicate that highest correlations were found with maternal depression, while the valence of unpleasant events was not correlated with any measures presented in the present study. Results support those found with the Unpleasant Events Schedule (Wierzbicki & Rexford, 1989). That is, while frequency scores on the Unpleasant Events Schedule were associated with maternal depression, valence scores were not. Valence scores on the Unpleasant Events Schedule were, however, very correlated for clinically depressed mothers with measures of cognitive variables such as the Automatic Thoughts Questionnaire and the Dysfunctional Attitude Scale. This suggests that lack of significance found in the present study for the valence of unpleasant events was perhaps due to lack of inclusion of cognitive measures, not due to lack of importance of the valence scale. Therefore, the valence of unpleasant events scores may provide meaningful information regarding mothers' cognitions about the aversiveness of specific setting events.

Further review of the relationships between supplemental measures and the pleasant and unpleasant events scales suggest that although moderate correlations

were found with measures of major setting events for both the pleasant and the unpleasant events scales, both scales appear capture information beyond that which is measured by the BDI, the DAS or the LES. That is, no one measure emerged as being highly intercorrelated with pleasant events or unpleasant events. As the original purpose for the development of the MAC was to provide researchers with a means to obtain information not easily obtained by existing measures of setting events, these results suggest the MAC does, in fact, meet this need.

Differences in MAC scores between distressed and nondistressed mothers suggest that both the original and new MAC score were excellent discriminators of clinical status and levels of maternal depression. These findings were also supported by discriminant analyses which revealed that the original scores and the new factors were highly accurate in classifying mothers by distressed groups. In fact, classification accuracy rates of at least 79 percent were indicated across clinical status and depression groups. In addition, classification rates were more accurate than all supplemental measures completed by mothers.

Comparison of means reveals that child clinical, marital clinical and depressed mothers all indicated that they experienced significantly fewer pleasant events (on both the new and original scales) and more frequent

aversive marital events (on the new scale) than did nondistressed mothers. All three distressed groups indicated that they experienced pleasant events as less enjoyable overall (on the original valence of pleasant events scale). Both child clinical mothers and depressed mothers indicated they experienced more unpleasant events (on both the new and original scales) and more aversive child behavior (on the new scale) than did nondistressed mothers.

Differences found in the present study between depressed and nondepressed mothers are consistent with previous findings. Lewinsohn (Lewinsohn, 1975; Lewinsohn & Amenson, 1978; Lewinsohn & Libet, 1972), for example, found that depressed subjects rated pleasant events as occurring less frequently and as being less enjoyable, while rating unpleasant events as occurring more frequently.

These differences may be explained by a number of possible hypotheses. One hypothesis is that distressed mothers may in fact be experiencing reductions in rates of pleasant events and increases in unpleasant events, aversive marital interactions, and aversive child behavior. An alternative hypothesis is that distressed mothers' perceptions of pleasant and unpleasant events may be specifically altered in a negative direction. Given observed decreases in distressed mothers' ratings on the valence of pleasant events and higher levels of depression

indicated for both child and marital clinical mothers, there appears to be some support for the second hypothesis.

A third hypothesis is that a more complex process may be occurring. That is, perhaps actual increases in unpleasant events are caused by (or cause) child behavior problems and marital distress which later distorts maternal perceptions of pleasant and unpleasant events. This hypothesis would be consistent with Wahler and Afton's (1980) findings that insular mothers (mothers who report low frequencies of pleasant interactions and who classified as low income) failed to alter their negative perceptions of their children's behavior at the conclusion of parent training. Changes failed to occur even when parent training was equally effective for insular and noninsular mothers in reducing children's noncompliant behavior.

A fourth hypothesis is that maternal depression is a underlying critical variable which may possibly explain differences in rates of pleasant and unpleasant events as well as changes in the enjoyability of such events. A followup study which compared depressed and nondepressed mothers seeking services for their children's behavior and marital distress would assist in providing information about the role of depression. Specific conclusions about which hypothesis might be most accurate cannot be made from the present study.

Comparison of the psychometric properties of the original MAC scores and the new MAC scores indicates that the new factors appear to be as good or better across all analyses. The revised MAC also provides specific information about rates of aversive child and marital events not easily obtained by the original MAC. Considering that the original measure consists of 100 items, the revised MAC (which consists of 45 items) might well be easier to use and be more attractive to researchers. The revised MAC would take less time to complete, be less expensive, easier to score, and might reduce the amount of error that a longer scale could produce.

The present study has several limitations, however. Although the current results provide support that the MAC may be a useful measure for research purposes, additional studies need to be conducted before it can be concluded that the MAC is a reliable and valid instrument for use by clinicians. Findings provide only preliminary evidence that the MAC may be useful as a clinical tool.

More specifically, the current results should be replicated to assure that the findings were not spurious. This includes conducting a confirmatory factor analysis to verify the current factor structure as well as a follow-up discriminant analysis to verify classification accuracy rates. In addition, despite efforts to obtain a

heterogeneous sample of mothers, the present results are largely based on a sample of mothers affiliated with a university and may not be equivalent to results obtained with a different sample of mothers.

Examination of the MAC's test-retest reliability is recommended to support the hypothesis that it is a reliable instrument over time. It is hypothesized that greater test-retest reliability may be found on specific subscales such as the frequency of marital conflict and aversive child behavior compared to the more diverse factors measuring pleasant and unpleasant events in general.

It also would be interesting to examine the utility of the MAC as a daily measure of setting events. This type of scale might be useful to clinicians during treatment to obtain more up-to-date information on setting events identified during assessment as problematic.

Additional support for the construct validity of the MAC (specifically for the subscale measuring the frequency of pleasant events) might be obtained by examining its relationship to measures not utilized in the current study. That is, review of the items included in the Pleasant Events factor indicate that it might be inversely related to maternal insularity, which has been found to decrease the generalizability of parent training effects (Wahler, 1980). A follow-up study with mothers classified on the

basis of insularity might provide interesting additional information.

Follow-up studies would also be recommended in order to examine the relationships between the valence of unpleasant events scores with measures of cognitive variables. Given the high correlations between the Unpleasant Events Schedule and cognitive measures such as the Automatic Thoughts Questionnaire and the Dysfunctional Attitude Scale (Wierzbicki & Rexford, 1989), examination of correlations between such measures with the MAC's unpleasant events scale could provide additional information on cognitive setting events which mothers experience.

## References


Beck, A. T., Ward, C. A., Mendelson, M., Mock, J. E., & Erbaugh, J. K. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 4, 561-571.

Bijou, S. W., & Baer, D. M. (1961). Child development II: Basics of infancy. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Bijou, S. W., & Baer, D. M. (1978). Behavior analysis of child development. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Bouman, T. K., & Lutejin. (1986). Relations between the Pleasant Events Schedule, depression and other aspects of psychopathology. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95, 373-377.

Brody, G. H., & Forehand, R. (1985). The efficacy of parent training with maritally distressed and nondistressed mothers: A multimethod assessment. Behavioral Research and Therapy, 23, 291-296.

Carper, L. B. (1988). Setting events and parent-child interactions: An assessment study. Unpublished dissertation, Louisiana State University.

Clark, D. B., & Baker, B. L. (1983). Brief reports: Predicting outcome in parent training. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 31, 309-311.

Crnic, K. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (1990). Minor parenting stresses with young children. Child Development, 61, 1628-1637.

Dadds, M. R., Sanders, M. R., & James, J. E. (1987a). The generalization of treatment effects in parent training with multidistressed parents. Behavioural Psychotherapy, 15, 289-313.

Dadds, M. R., Schwartz, S. & Sanders, M. R. (1987b). Marital discord and treatment outcome in behavioral treatment of child conduct disorders. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 396-403.

Eyberg, S. M., & Ross, A. W. (1978). Assessment of child behavior problems: The validation of a new inventory. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 7, 113-116.

Griest, D. L., & Wells, K. C. (1983). Behavioral family therapy with conduct disorders in children. Behavior Therapy, 14, 37-53.

Griest, D. L., Forehand, R., & Wells, K. C. (1981). Follow-up assessment of parent behavioral training: An analysis of who will participate. Child Study Journal, 11, 221-229.

Hollingshead, A. B., & Redlich, F. C. (1958). Social class and mental illness: A community study. New York: Hohn Wiley & Sons.

Kantor, J. R. (1959). Interbehavioral psychology. Granville, OH: Principia Press.

Kelley, M. L., & Carper, L. B. (1988). The Mothers' Activity Checklist: An instrument for assessing pleasant and unpleasant events. Behavioral Assessment, 10, 331-341.

Lewinsohn, P. M. (1975). The unpleasant events schedule: A scale for the measurement of aversive events. University of Oregon. (Mimeo).

Lewinsohn, P. M., & Amenson, C. S. (1978). Some relations between pleasant and unpleasant mood-related events Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87, 644-654.

Lewinsohn, P. M., & Libet, J. (1972). Pleasant events, activity schedules, and depression. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 79, 291-259.

Metcalfe, M., & Goldman, E. (1965). Validation of an inventory for measuring depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 27, 330-333.

Oltmanns, T. F., Broderick, J. E., & O'Leary, K. D. (1977). Marital adjustment and the efficacy of behavior therapy with children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 724-729.

Patterson, G. R. (1982). Coercive Family Process. Eugene, Oregon: Castalia Publishing Company.

Reisinger, J. J., Grangia, G. W., & Hoffman, E. H. (1976). Toddler management training: Generalization and marital status. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 7, 335-340.

Robinson, E. A., Eyberg, S. M., & Ross, A. W. (1980). Inventory of child problem behaviors: The

standardization of an inventory of child conduct problem behaviors. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 9, 22-28.

Saranson, I. G., Johnson, J. H., & Siegel, J. M. (1978). Assessing the impact of life changes: Development of the Life Experiences Survey. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 932-946.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-28.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1990). Statistical Abstract of the United States: The National Databook. (110th ed.). Washington, D.C.

Wahler, R. G. (1980). The insular mother: Her problems in parent-child treatment. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 13, 207-219.

Wahler, R. G., & Afton, A. D. (1980). Attentional processes in insular and noninsular mothers: Some differences in their summary reports about child problem behaviors. Child Behavior Therapy, 2, 25-41.

Wahler, R. G., & Fox, J. J. (1981). Setting events in applied behavior analysis: Toward a conceptual and methodological expansion. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 14, 327-338.

Wahler, R. G., Leske, G., & Rogers, E. S. (1979). The insular family: A deviance support system for oppositional children. In L. A. Hamerlynck (Ed.), Behavioral systems for the developmentally disabled: I. School and home environments. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Incorporated.

Webster-Stratton, C. (1985). Predictors of treatment outcome in parent training for conduct disordered children. Behavior Therapy, 16, 223-243.

Wierzbicki, M., & Rexford, L. (1989). Cognitive and behavioral correlates of depression in clinical and nonclinical populations. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 45, 872-877.

Williams, J. G., Barlow, D. H., Agras, W. S. (1972). Behavioral measurement of severe depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, 27, 330-333.

# Appendix A

MOTHER'S ACTIVITY CHECKLIST

The following is a list of activities that parents may experience. This list contains both pleasant and unpleasant items. For each item rate how many times you experienced the event in the LAST TWO WEEKS; For items experienced AT LEAST ONCE in the past two weeks, rate how pleasant or unpleasant the event generally was.

A pleasant activity is one that is pleasant, enjoyable or rewarding. An unpleasant activity is one that is aversive, unpleasant, or punishing. There is no right or wrong answer. For each activity, please refer to the scale below.

Please use the following scale to rate how often you experienced each item:

1 = This has not happened to me in the last 2 weeks.

2 = This has happened a few times (1 to 3) in the last 2 weeks.

3 = This has happened several times (4 to 7) in the last 2 weeks.

4 = This has happened often (8 to 12 times) in the last 2 weeks.

5 = This has happened very often (13 or more times) in the last 2 weeks.

EXAMPLE:

| | HOW OFTEN? | HOW PLEASANT? |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Going to the doctor. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7<br>very unpleasant — neutral — very pleasant |

# MOTHER'S ACTIVITY CHECKLIST

DATE _____

SCALE

How often? 1 2 3 4 5
(Ø)(1-3)(4-7)(8-12)(13 or more)

How pleasant? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unpleasant — neutral — very pleasant

| | | HOW OFTEN? | | | | | HOW PLEASANT? | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Being affectionate with my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. | Laughing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. | Looking attractive. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. | Having something break. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. | Seeing my child learn something new. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. | Losing something. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. | Not accomplishing my goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. | Not getting enough sleep or not sleeping well. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. | Making love. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. | Playing with a pet. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. | Spending time with my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. | Playing with my child or watching him/her play. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. | Finishing a chore. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. | Being complimented by someone other than my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. | Receiving affection from my child (e.g., appreciative statements, hugs). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. | Receiving an unpleasant phone call. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17. | Having privacy or time for myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. | Spending time with children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. | Having problems at work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20. | Having trouble getting ready in the morning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21. | Having my child do something for him/herself (e.g., getting dressed). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22. | Having my spouse work too hard or too late. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23. | Arguing with a family member or friend. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24. | Reading with my child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

SCALE

How often? 1 2 3 4 5
(0)(1-3)(4-7)(8-12)(13 or more)

How pleasant? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unpleasant — neutral — very pleasant

| | | HOW OFTEN? | | | | | HOW PLEASANT? | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25. | Making a new friend. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 26. | Staying home when I want to be out. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27. | Knowing that my child is doing well in school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 28. | Learning that something bad has happened to a friend or relative. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 29. | Seeing roaches or pests in my home. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 30. | Visiting with relatives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 31. | Having my child do something without being told (e.g., cleaning up, homework). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 32. | Watching an unpleasant TV show. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 33. | Doing an errand when I don't want to. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 34. | Being late or having to rush. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 35. | Hearing my child cry. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 36. | Taking a relaxing bath or shower. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 37. | Sticking to my diet. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 38. | Spending time with friends. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 39. | Having my child misbehave at bedtime. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 40. | Forgetting something. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 41. | Working on a hobby. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 42. | Doing something I enjoy away from home. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 43. | Having my children make a mess. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 44. | Missing work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 45. | Having things go well at work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 46. | Exercising or dancing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 47. | Taking a walk. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 48. | Unpleasant driving (e.g., bad traffic, long distance, bad weather) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 49. | Seeing my children fight. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

SCALE

How often? 1 2 3 4 5
(0)(1-3)(4-7)(8-12)(13 or more)

How pleasant? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unpleasant — neutral — very pleasant

| | | HOW OFTEN? | | | | | HOW PLEASANT? | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50. | Preparing a good meal. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 51. | Helping someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 52. | Having my child eat properly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 53. | Being lied to. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 54. | Being criticized by a friend or relative. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 55. | Having my spouse help with disciplining or caring for the children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 56. | Being nagged by my children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 57. | Having my spouse not help enough around the house. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 58. | Watching a good TV show. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 59. | Not having enough money to buy needed items. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 60. | Finding out good news. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 61. | Having my child not cooperate with something she/he has to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 62. | Having my child tell me about something good that happened to her/him. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 63. | Having my child embarrass me in public. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 64. | Knowing that a family member is sick or hurting. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 65. | Arguing with my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 66. | Shopping. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 67. | Not having enough privacy or time for myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 68. | Going to church. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 69. | Having my child disobey me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 70. | Having someone break a promise. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 71. | Enjoying a good meal at home. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 72. | Receiving a favor from someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 73. | Being around rude or unpleasant people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 74. | Reading. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

SCALE

How often? 1 2 3 4 5
(0)(1-3)(4-7)(8-12)(13 or more)

How pleasant? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unpleasant — neutral — very pleasant

| | | HOW OFTEN? | | | | | HOW PLEASANT? | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 75. | Having my spouse do something nice for me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 76. | Acting foolish or stupid around others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 77. | Having a good conversation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 78. | Expressing my love to someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 79. | Being asked for my advice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 80. | Doing something poorly or making a mistake. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 81. | Looking unattractive. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 82. | Being left out or ignored. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 83. | Amusing people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 84. | Having my child behave well in public. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 85. | Having my spouse ignore the children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 86. | Having a good idea or solving a problem. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 87. | Eating a meal I dislike. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 88. | Being confused; not knowing what to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 89. | Not being able to spend time with people I care about. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 90. | Having to pay an expensive bill. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 91. | Complimenting someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 92. | Being relaxed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 93. | Having my spouse ignore me when I am talking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 94. | Having too much to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 95. | Hearing something good about a friend or family member. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 96. | Being criticized or nagged by my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 97. | Being interrupted. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 98. | Having someone criticize my child or another family member | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 99. | Being taken for granted by my spouse | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 100. | Being complimented by my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

# Appendix B

THE REVISED MOTHER'S ACTIVITY CHECKLIST

The following is a list of activities that parents may experience. This list contains both pleasant and unpleasant items. For each item rate how many times you experienced the event in the LAST TWO WEEKS; For items experienced AT LEAST ONCE in the past two weeks, rate how pleasant or unpleasant the event generally was.

A pleasant activity is one that is pleasant, enjoyable or rewarding. An unpleasant activity is one that is aversive, unpleasant, or punishing. There is no right or wrong answer. For each activity, please refer to the scale below.

Please use the following scale to rate how often you experienced each item:

1 = This has not happened to me in the last 2 weeks.

2 = This has happened a few times (1 to 3) in the last 2 weeks.

3 = This has happened several times (4 to 7) in the last 2 weeks.

4 = This has happened often (8 to 12 times) in the last 2 weeks.

5 = This has happened very often (13 or more times) in the last 2 weeks.

EXAMPLE:

| | HOW OFTEN? | HOW PLEASANT? |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Going to the doctor. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 (very unpleasant) 2 3 4 (neutral) 5 6 7 (very pleasant) |

# MOTHER'S ACTIVITY CHECKLIST

NAME _____ DATE _____

| How often? | How pleasant? |
|---|---|
| 1 (0) 2 (1-3) 3 (4-7) 4 (8-12) 5 (13 or more) | 1 very unpleasant 2 3 4 neutral 5 6 7 very pleasant |

| | | HOW OFTEN? | | | | | HOW PLEASANT? | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Laughing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. | Looking attractive. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. | Seeing my child learn something new. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. | Not accomplishing my goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. | Not getting enough sleep or not sleeping well. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. | Finishing a chore. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. | Being complimented by someone other than my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. | Receiving affection from my child. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. | Having privacy or time for myself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | | HOW OFTEN? | | | | | HOW PLEASANT? | | | | | | |
| 10. | Spending time with my children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. | Having problems at work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. | Having trouble getting ready in the morning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. | Having my child do something without being told. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. | Being late or having to rush. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. | Hearing my child cry. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. | Taking a relaxing bath or shower. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

How often?

1 2 3 4 5
(0) (1-3) (4-7) (8-12) (13 or more)

How pleasant?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
very unpleasant neutral very pleasant

| | | HOW OFTEN? | | | | | HOW PLEASANT? | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. | Spending time with friends. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18. | Having my child misbehave at bedtime. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 19. | Doing something I enjoy away from home. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 20. | Having my children make a mess. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 21. | Seeing my children fight. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 22. | Helping someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 23. | Being nagged by my children. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 24. | Having my spouse not help enough around the house. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 25. | Watching a good TV show. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 26. | Finding out good news. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27. | Having my child not cooperate with something she/he has to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | | HOW OFTEN? | | | | | HOW PLEASANT? | | | | | | |
| 28. | Having my child tell me about something good that happened to her/him. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 29. | Arguing with my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 30. | Having my child disobey me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 31. | Enjoying a good meal at home. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 32. | Receiving a favor from someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 33. | Reading. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 34. | Having a good conversation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

| How often? | | | | | | How pleasant? | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 (0) | 2 (1-3) | 3 (4-7) | 4 (8-12) | 5 (13 or more) | | 1 very unpleasant | 2 | 3 | 4 neutral | 5 | 6 | 7 very pleasant |
| | | | | | | HOW OFTEN? | | | | | HOW PLEASANT? | |
| 35. | Expressing my love to someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 36. | Amusing people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 37. | Having my child behave well in public. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 38. | Having my spouse ignore the children | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 39. | Not being able to spend time with people I care about. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 40. | Having to pay an expensive bill. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 41. | Having my spouse ignore me when I am talking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 42. | Having too much to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 43. | Hearing something good about a friend or family member. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 44. | Being criticized or nagged by my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 45. | Being taken for granted by my spouse. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Appendix C

Factor Loadings from Principal Components Analysis with Varimax Rotation

| ITEM | Factor 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor 1 (Pleasant Events) | | | | |
| 77. Good Conversation | .66 | .02 | -.07 | .04 |
| 38. Spending time w/ friends | .61 | -.03 | .06 | -.13 |
| 60. Good news | .56 | -.11 | .14 | .10 |
| 95. Heard something good | .56 | -.18 | .15 | .19 |
| 51. Helping someone | .53 | .08 | .12 | .19 |
| 42. Doing something enjoyable | .52 | -.05 | .09 | -.10 |
| 71. Having a good meal | .52 | .08 | -.12 | -.14 |
| 78. Expressing love | .52 | .12 | -.18 | .04 |
| 62. Child tell something good | .52 | .10 | .00 | .26 |
| 14. Being complimented | .52 | -.06 | .15 | .07 |
| 84. Child behave well | .49 | -.26 | .04 | .24 |
| 3. Looking attractive | .48 | -.04 | .03 | -.15 |
| 36. Relaxing bath | .47 | -.10 | -.01 | -.18 |
| 72. Receiving a favor | .47 | -.02 | .16 | .19 |
| 2. Laughing | .46 | .16 | -.20 | -.12 |
| 83. Amusing people | .45 | -.00 | .08 | .16 |
| 58. Good TV show | .44 | .08 | .07 | -.14 |
| 15. Affection from child | .44 | .19 | -.14 | .10 |
| 5. Child learn | .43 | .05 | .03 | .09 |
| 17. Privacy for self | .43 | -.05 | .05 | -.25 |
| 18. Time with children | .43 | .18 | -.12 | -.06 |
| 13. Finishing a chore | .42 | .15 | -.04 | -.06 |
| 74. Reading | .42 | -.02 | -.07 | .03 |
| 31. Child does something on own | .41 | -.25 | -.08 | .10 |
| Factor 2 (Aversive Child Behavior) | | | | |
| 69. Child disobey me | .00 | .77 | .15 | .09 |
| 43. Child make a mess | .02 | .70 | .09 | .16 |
| 61. Child embarrass me | .11 | .70 | .13 | .19 |
| 35. Hearing child cry | .02 | .65 | .09 | .10 |
| 56. Being nagged | -.06 | .61 | .09 | .16 |
| 39. Child misbehave | .01 | .56 | .16 | .01 |
| 49. Child fight | .02 | .52 | .07 | .12 |

Appendix C (cont.)

| ITEM | Factor 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor 3 (Aversive Marital Events) | | | | |
| 96. Nagged by spouse | .01 | .07 | .79 | .15 |
| 99. Taken for granted | .00 | .13 | .75 | .15 |
| 65. Arguing with spouse | .05 | .13 | .72 | .08 |
| 93. Spouse ignoring me | .02 | .10 | .65 | .14 |
| 85. Spouse ignoring children | -.03 | .21 | .61 | .10 |
| 57. Spouse not helping around the house | .03 | .17 | .55 | .03 |
| Factor 4 (Unpleasant Events) | | | | |
| 94. Too much to do | .06 | .19 | .07 | .62 |
| 34. Being late | .06 | .19 | .01 | .62 |
| 89. No time | .00 | .00 | .18 | .51 |
| 8. Not enough sleep | -.06 | .10 | .06 | .50 |
| 19. Problems at work | -.04 | -.06 | .10 | .50 |
| 20. Trouble getting ready | -.03 | .20 | -.00 | .49 |
| 90. Expensive bill | .15 | .01 | .13 | .46 |
| 7. Not acc. goals | -.02 | .18 | .08 | .46 |
| Eigenvalues | 6.24 | 5.20 | 2.53 | 2.08 |
| Percent of variance | 13.90 | 11.60 | 5.60 | 4.60 |

Appendix D

Item-total Correlations for the 100-item Measure

| Item | Item-Total Correlations | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .34 | 3.55 | 1.21 |
| 2 | .38 | 4.20 | 1.00 |
| 3 | .40 | 3.48 | 1.05 |
| 4 | .23 | 1.62 | .73 |
| 5 | .40 | 3.00 | 1.05 |
| 6 | .33 | 1.81 | .92 |
| 7 | .44 | 2.19 | .95 |
| 8 | .32 | 2.79 | 1.15 |
| 9 | .25 | 2.65 | .97 |
| 10 | .19 | 2.29 | 1.47 |
| 11 | .39 | 3.22 | 1.22 |
| 12 | .38 | 3.93 | 1.10 |
| 13 | .37 | 3.74 | 1.13 |
| 14 | .43 | 2.69 | .96 |
| 15 | .38 | 4.25 | .97 |
| 16 | .31 | 1.48 | .82 |
| 17 | .36 | 2.32 | 1.02 |
| 18 | .33 | 4.09 | 1.05 |
| 19 | .30 | 1.83 | 1.06 |
| 20 | .35 | 2.31 | 1.15 |
| 21 | .35 | 3.65 | 1.21 |
| 22 | .20 | 2.56 | 1.34 |
| 23 | .39 | 1.96 | .99 |
| 24 | .32 | 3.12 | 1.30 |
| 25 | .37 | 1.70 | .84 |
| 26 | .36 | 1.99 | 1.07 |
| 27 | .35 | 2.81 | 1.37 |
| 28 | .27 | 1.62 | .70 |
| 29 | .26 | 1.97 | .99 |
| 30 | .24 | 2.53 | 1.08 |
| 31 | .39 | 2.40 | 1.03 |
| 32 | .27 | 1.40 | .67 |
| 33 | .45 | 2.32 | .99 |

Appendix D (cont.)

| Item | Item-Total Correlations | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | .44 | 2.92 | 1.19 |
| 35 | .41 | 2.79 | 1.23 |
| 36 | .38 | 2.68 | 1.35 |
| 37 | .30 | 1.95 | 1.20 |
| 38 | .55 | 2.40 | 1.03 |
| 39 | .34 | 2.33 | 1.14 |
| 40 | .49 | 2.35 | .94 |
| 41 | .32 | 1.74 | 1.03 |
| 42 | .44 | 2.20 | 1.09 |
| 43 | .48 | 3.20 | 1.25 |
| 44 | .19 | 1.29 | .62 |
| 45 | .34 | 2.73 | 1.37 |
| 46 | .31 | 2.05 | 1.23 |
| 47 | .31 | 1.89 | 1.10 |
| 48 | .31 | 2.32 | 1.14 |
| 49 | .34 | 2.36 | 1.35 |
| 50 | .31 | 3.26 | 1.09 |
| 51 | .45 | 3.11 | 1.11 |
| 52 | .34 | 3.50 | 1.03 |
| 53 | .41 | 1.79 | .92 |
| 54 | .42 | 1.75 | .85 |
| 55 | .34 | 3.47 | 1.21 |
| 56 | .44 | 2.76 | 1.27 |
| 57 | .32 | 2.39 | 1.28 |
| 58 | .33 | 2.48 | .99 |
| 59 | .34 | 2.39 | 1.38 |
| 60 | .52 | 2.20 | .84 |
| 61 | .51 | 2.65 | 1.08 |
| 62 | .46 | 3.00 | 1.04 |
| 63 | .37 | 1.69 | .88 |
| 64 | .25 | 1.78 | .85 |
| 65 | .42 | 2.13 | .91 |
| 66 | .35 | 2.54 | .97 |

Appendix D (cont.)

| Item | Item-Total Correlations | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 67 | .38 | 2.72 | 1.26 |
| 68 | .21 | 2.06 | 1.03 |
| 69 | .48 | 2.65 | 1.09 |
| 70 | .40 | 1.47 | .77 |
| 71 | .47 | 3.25 | 1.08 |
| 72 | .37 | 2.07 | .92 |
| 73 | .36 | 1.98 | 1.00 |
| 74 | .34 | 3.04 | 1.34 |
| 75 | .45 | 2.77 | 1.04 |
| 76 | .34 | 1.62 | .82 |
| 77 | .61 | 3.00 | 1.03 |
| 78 | .45 | 3.73 | 1.22 |
| 79 | .49 | 2.73 | 1.09 |
| 80 | .45 | 2.12 | .78 |
| 81 | .35 | 2.23 | .94 |
| 82 | .49 | 1.65 | .88 |
| 83 | .41 | 2.45 | 1.14 |
| 84 | .42 | 3.19 | 1.08 |
| 85 | .44 | 1.67 | .95 |
| 86 | .48 | 2.57 | .95 |
| 87 | .36 | 1.38 | .65 |
| 88 | .53 | 2.11 | 1.01 |
| 89 | .37 | 2.33 | 1.11 |
| 90 | .36 | 2.25 | .97 |
| 91 | .42 | 3.06 | 1.01 |
| 92 | .44 | 2.61 | 1.08 |
| 93 | .45 | 2.09 | 1.01 |
| 94 | .41 | 3.61 | 1.27 |
| 95 | .46 | 2.30 | .89 |
| 96 | .50 | 1.95 | 1.02 |
| 97 | .49 | 2.58 | 1.20 |
| 98 | .45 | 1.68 | .84 |
| 99 | .48 | 2.20 | 1.21 |
| 100 | .39 | 2.66 | 1.14 |

Appendix E

Item-total Correlations for the New 45-item Measure

| Item | Item-Total Correlations | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| Factor 1 (Pleasant Events) | | | |
| 77 | .61 | 3.00 | 1.03 |
| 38 | .53 | 2.40 | 1.03 |
| 60 | .49 | 2.20 | .84 |
| 95 | .48 | 2.30 | .89 |
| 51 | .46 | 3.11 | 1.11 |
| 42 | .44 | 2.20 | 1.09 |
| 71 | .44 | 3.25 | 1.08 |
| 78 | .44 | 3.73 | 1.22 |
| 62 | .45 | 3.00 | 1.04 |
| 14 | .46 | 2.69 | .96 |
| 84 | .42 | 3.19 | 1.08 |
| 3 | .39 | 3.48 | 1.05 |
| 36 | .36 | 2.68 | 1.35 |
| 72 | .39 | 2.07 | .92 |
| 2 | .38 | 4.20 | 1.00 |
| 83 | .39 | 2.45 | 1.14 |
| 58 | .38 | 2.48 | .99 |
| 15 | .39 | 4.25 | .97 |
| 5 | .38 | 3.00 | 1.05 |
| 17 | .35 | 2.32 | 1.02 |
| 18 | .34 | 4.09 | 1.05 |
| 13 | .38 | 3.74 | 1.13 |
| 74 | .35 | 3.04 | 1.34 |
| 31 | .32 | 2.40 | 1.03 |
| Factor 2 (Aversive Child Behavior) | | | |
| 69 | .68 | 2.65 | 1.09 |
| 43 | .60 | 3.20 | 1.25 |
| 35 | .51 | 2.79 | 1.23 |
| 61 | .62 | 2.65 | 1.08 |
| 56 | .54 | 2.76 | 1.28 |
| 39 | .47 | 2.33 | 1.14 |
| 49 | .45 | 2.36 | 1.35 |

Appendix E (cont.)

| Item | Item-Total Correlations | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| Factor 3 (Aversive Marital Events) | | | |
| 96 | .67 | 1.95 | 1.02 |
| 99 | .68 | 2.20 | 1.21 |
| 65 | .58 | 2.13 | .91 |
| 93 | .55 | 2.09 | 1.01 |
| 85 | .54 | 1.67 | .95 |
| 57 | .44 | 2.39 | 1.28 |
| Factor 4 (Unpleasant Events) | | | |
| 94 | .45 | 3.61 | 1.27 |
| 34 | .52 | 2.92 | 1.19 |
| 89 | .36 | 2.33 | 1.11 |
| 19 | .36 | 1.83 | 1.06 |
| 8 | .38 | 2.79 | 1.15 |
| 7 | .37 | 2.19 | .95 |
| 90 | .32 | 2.25 | .97 |
| 20 | .42 | 2.31 | 1.15 |

Appendix F

Descriptive Data on the Original Mother's Activity Checklist Variables by Socioeconomic Status

| Variable | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FPOS | | | | |
| Level 1 | 136.42 | 25.96 | 207 | p>.05 |
| Level 2 | 135.24 | 22.55 | 198 | |
| Level 3 | 138.28 | 23.01 | 191 | |
| Level 4 | 141.48 | 23.62 | 202 | |
| FNEG | | | | |
| Level 1 | 105.47 | 24.37 | 207 | p>.05 |
| Level 2 | 102.33 | 21.79 | 198 | |
| Level 3 | 102.98 | 20.31 | 191 | |
| Level 4 | 102.73 | 19.01 | 202 | |
| VPOS | | | | |
| Level 1 | 232.76 | 46.87 | 207 | p<.0001 |
| Level 2 | 242.21 | 41.11 | 198 | |
| Level 3 | 246.39 | 38.45 | 191 | |
| Level 4 | 251.52 | 43.78 | 202 | |
| VNEG | | | | |
| Level 1 | 74.49 | 28.59 | 207 | p>.05 |
| Level 2 | 75.73 | 26.44 | 198 | |
| Level 3 | 77.71 | 24.13 | 191 | |
| Level 4 | 76.53 | 23.01 | 202 | |

Appendix G

Descriptive Data on the Original Mother's Activity Checklist Variables by Maternal Education

| Variable | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FPOS | | | | |
| Less than high school | 134.20 | 21.74 | 34 | p<.03 |
| Completed high school | 133.51 | 23.71 | 182 | |
| Some college | 138.04 | 25.18 | 347 | |
| Completed college | 138.82 | 23.24 | 197 | |
| Graduate/professional training | 143.39 | 21.31 | 71 | |
| FNEG | | | | |
| Less than high school | 113.35 | 24.43 | 34 | p<.008 |
| Completed high school | 100.75 | 23.34 | 182 | |
| Some college | 104.44 | 21.41 | 347 | |
| Completed college | 102.77 | 20.28 | 197 | |
| Graduate/professional training | 99.02 | 17.87 | 71 | |
| VPOS | | | | |
| Less than high school | 213.70 | 49.15 | 34 | p<.0001 |
| Completed high school | 239.31 | 44.37 | 182 | |
| Some college | 241.80 | 42.80 | 347 | |
| Completed college | 247.77 | 42.45 | 197 | |
| Graduate/professional training | 245.53 | 33.19 | 71 | |
| VNEG | | | | |
| Less than high school | 71.14 | 27.02 | 34 | p<.0005 |
| Completed high school | 69.29 | 26.39 | 182 | |
| Some college | 79.37 | 26.21 | 347 | |
| Completed college | 76.67 | 23.61 | 197 | |
| Graduate/professional training | 75.95 | 20.19 | 71 | |

Appendix H

Descriptive Data on the New Mother's Activity Checklist Factors by Maternal Education

| Variable | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pleasant Events | | | | |
| Less than high school | 70.47 | 13.16 | 34 | p>.05 |
| Completed high school | 69.01 | 12.73 | 182 | |
| Some college | 71.46 | 12.98 | 347 | |
| Completed college | 71.06 | 12.24 | 197 | |
| Graduate/professional training | 73.16 | 10.58 | 71 | |
| Aversive Child Behavior | | | | |
| Less than high school | 21.97 | 6.72 | 34 | p<.001 |
| Completed high school | 18.19 | 5.88 | 182 | |
| Some college | 18.68 | 5.82 | 347 | |
| Completed college | 18.87 | 5.61 | 197 | |
| Graduate/professional training | 17.05 | 4.85 | 71 | |
| Aversive Marital Behavior | | | | |
| Less than high school | 14.04 | 5.20 | 21 | p>.05 |
| Completed high school | 12.46 | 4.87 | 148 | |
| Some college | 12.56 | 4.66 | 260 | |
| Completed college | 12.30 | 4.55 | 159 | |
| Graduate/professional training | 11.18 | 3.79 | 66 | |
| Unpleasant Events | | | | |
| Less than high school | 20.73 | 5.62 | 34 | p<.02 |
| Completed high school | 19.13 | 5.05 | 182 | |
| Some college | 20.61 | 5.13 | 347 | |
| Completed college | 20.09 | 5.08 | 197 | |
| Graduate/professional training | 19.57 | 4.53 | 71 | |

Appendix I

Descriptive Data on the Original Mother's Activity Checklist Variables by Income Level

| Variable | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FPOS | | | | |
| $0-4,999 | 130.36 | 23.51 | 38 | p<.0006 |
| $5,000 - 9,999 | 130.15 | 24.41 | 40 | |
| $10,000 - 14,999 | 132.25 | 24.99 | 56 | |
| $15,000 - 24,999 | 134.48 | 25.23 | 131 | |
| $25,000 - 34,999 | 136.65 | 24.82 | 158 | |
| $35,000 - 49,999 | 138.86 | 22.26 | 160 | |
| $50,000 and up | 142.86 | 23.15 | 224 | |
| FNEG | | | | |
| $0-4,999 | 98.28 | 23.80 | 38 | p>.05 |
| $5,000 - 9,999 | 105.60 | 27.70 | 40 | |
| $10,000 - 14,999 | 98.16 | 18.20 | 56 | |
| $15,000 - 24,999 | 104.23 | 25.45 | 131 | |
| $25,000 - 34,999 | 104.32 | 22.73 | 158 | |
| $35,000 - 49,999 | 101.85 | 19.89 | 160 | |
| $50,000 and up | 103.90 | 18.50 | 224 | |
| VPOS | | | | |
| $0-4,999 | 207.52 | 38.22 | 38 | p<.0001 |
| $5,000 - 9,999 | 222.75 | 38.30 | 40 | |
| $10,000 - 14,999 | 232.14 | 43.21 | 56 | |
| $15,000 - 24,999 | 230.85 | 42.47 | 131 | |
| $25,000 - 34,999 | 241.03 | 47.29 | 158 | |
| $35,000 - 49,999 | 250.70 | 35.67 | 160 | |
| $50,000 and up | 255.56 | 40.93 | 224 | |
| VNEG | | | | |
| $0-4,999 | 65.89 | 27.64 | 38 | p>.05 |
| $5,000 - 9,999 | 74.70 | 33.11 | 40 | |
| $10,000 - 14,999 | 72.66 | 25.07 | 56 | |
| $15,000 - 24,999 | 75.69 | 24.07 | 131 | |
| $25,000 - 34,999 | 77.53 | 25.49 | 158 | |
| $35,000 - 49,999 | 77.61 | 26.50 | 160 | |
| $50,000 and up | 76.48 | 24.05 | 224 | |

Appendix J

Descriptive Data on the New Mother's Activity Checklist Factors by Income Level

| Variable | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pleasant Events | | | | |
| $0-4,999 | 73.89 | 14.45 | 38 | p>.05 |
| $5,000 - 9,999 | 72.47 | 12.99 | 40 | |
| $10,000 - 14,999 | 71.55 | 12.95 | 56 | |
| $15,000 - 24,999 | 71.30 | 13.20 | 131 | |
| $25,000 - 34,999 | 69.79 | 13.32 | 158 | |
| $35,000 - 49,999 | 69.86 | 11.54 | 160 | |
| $50,000 and up | 71.43 | 12.03 | 224 | |
| Aversive Child Behavior | | | | |
| $0-4,999 | 18.94 | 6.22 | 38 | p>.05 |
| $5,000 - 9,999 | 19.17 | 6.29 | 40 | |
| $10,000 - 14,999 | 18.26 | 4.58 | 56 | |
| $15,000 - 24,999 | 18.80 | 6.08 | 131 | |
| $25,000 - 34,999 | 18.74 | 6.01 | 158 | |
| $35,000 - 49,999 | 18.25 | 6.10 | 160 | |
| $50,000 and up | 18.45 | 5.51 | 224 | |
| Aversive Marital Events | | | | |
| $0-4,999 | 12.72 | 3.74 | 38 | p<.007 |
| $5,000 - 9,999 | 14.14 | 5.39 | 40 | |
| $10,000 - 14,999 | 12.58 | 3.93 | 56 | |
| $15,000 - 24,999 | 14.00 | 5.61 | 131 | |
| $25,000 - 34,999 | 12.62 | 4.65 | 158 | |
| $35,000 - 49,999 | 11.72 | 3.96 | 160 | |
| $50,000 and up | 11.91 | 4.48 | 224 | |
| Unpleasant Events | | | | |
| $0-4,999 | 18.57 | 5.36 | 38 | p>.05 |
| $5,000 - 9,999 | 21.17 | 6.11 | 40 | |
| $10,000 - 14,999 | 19.94 | 4.44 | 56 | |
| $15,000 - 24,999 | 20.31 | 5.67 | 131 | |
| $25,000 - 34,999 | 19.98 | 5.27 | 158 | |
| $35,000 - 49,999 | 19.90 | 4.98 | 160 | |
| $50,000 and up | 20.22 | 4.63 | 224 | |

Appendix K

Descriptive Data on the Original Mother's Activity Checklist Variables by Race

| Variable | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FPOS | | | | |
| Black | 138.13 | 29.70 | 136 | p>.05 |
| White | 137.53 | 22.72 | 678 | |
| FNEG | | | | |
| Black | 99.35 | 23.79 | 136 | p<.02 |
| White | 104.22 | 20.96 | 678 | |
| VPOS | | | | |
| Black | 231.09 | 43.81 | 136 | p<.0007 |
| White | 244.90 | 42.87 | 678 | |
| VNEG | | | | |
| Black | 73.05 | 30.62 | 136 | p>.05 |
| White | 76.61 | 24.32 | 678 | |

Appendix L

Descriptive Data on the New Mother's Activity Checklist Factors by Race

| Factor | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pleasant Events | | | | |
| Black | 74.58 | 15.96 | 136 | p<.0003 |
| White | 70.26 | 11.67 | 678 | |
| Aversive Child Behavior | | | | |
| Black | 17.42 | 5.19 | 136 | p<.004 |
| White | 18.95 | 5.85 | 678 | |
| Aversive Marital Events | | | | |
| Black | 12.89 | 5.45 | 79 | p>.05 |
| White | 12.32 | 4.52 | 565 | |
| Unpleasant Events | | | | |
| Black | 19.25 | 5.99 | 136 | p<.04 |
| White | 20.23 | 4.89 | 678 | |

Appendix M

Descriptive Data on the Original Mother's Activity Checklist Variables by Marital Status

| Variable | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FPOS | | | | |
| Married | 140.56 | 23.12 | 636 | p<.0001 |
| Living with someone | 147.20 | 30.82 | 20 | |
| Divorced | 126.70 | 21.79 | 84 | |
| Separated | 121.00 | 24.62 | 44 | |
| Single | 126.73 | 22.20 | 49 | |
| FNEG | | | | |
| Married | 105.48 | 21.34 | 636 | p<.0001 |
| Living with someone | 109.10 | 26.18 | 20 | |
| Divorced | 93.73 | 18.71 | 84 | |
| Separated | 92.22 | 16.88 | 44 | |
| Single | 95.42 | 21.91 | 49 | |
| VPOS | | | | |
| Married | 249.41 | 41.92 | 636 | p<.0001 |
| Living with someone | 261.55 | 42.55 | 20 | |
| Divorced | 216.15 | 32.76 | 84 | |
| Separated | 204.09 | 49.04 | 44 | |
| Single | 222.75 | 27.47 | 49 | |
| VNEG | | | | |
| Married | 77.26 | 25.80 | 636 | p<.02 |
| Living with someone | 77.05 | 23.95 | 20 | |
| Divorced | 73.00 | 24.42 | 84 | |
| Separated | 69.72 | 23.28 | 44 | |
| Single | 67.08 | 23.92 | 49 | |

Appendix N

Descriptive Data on the Original Mother's Activity Checklist Variables by Distressed Status

| Variable | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FPOS | | | | |
| Child clinical | 131.35 | 22.52 | 45 | p<.02 |
| Child nonclinical | 140.23 | 24.57 | 526 | |
| Marital clinical | 116.00 | 15.99 | 15 | p<.0001 |
| Marital nonclinical | 146.07 | 22.86 | 128 | |
| Low depression | 140.01 | 24.36 | 365 | p<.001 |
| High depression | 118.26 | 20.00 | 42 | |
| FNEG | | | | |
| Child clinical | 123.15 | 24.57 | 45 | p<.0001 |
| Child nonclinical | 98.09 | 19.94 | 526 | |
| Marital clinical | 105.53 | 26.71 | 15 | p>.05 |
| Marital nonclinical | 94.69 | 19.30 | 128 | |
| Low depression | 96.82 | 19.58 | 365 | p<.001 |
| High depression | 117.69 | 18.63 | 42 | |
| VPOS | | | | |
| Child clinical | 225.66 | 44.24 | 45 | p<.002 |
| Child nonclinical | 246.43 | 42.60 | 526 | |
| Marital clinical | 222.73 | 45.37 | 15 | p<.003 |
| Marital nonclinical | 256.67 | 41.18 | 128 | |
| Low depression | 249.37 | 41.10 | 365 | p<.001 |
| High depression | 201.47 | 45.64 | 42 | |
| VNEG | | | | |
| Child clinical | 76.24 | 23.07 | 45 | p>.05 |
| Child nonclinical | 75.37 | 26.54 | 526 | |
| Marital clinical | 79.66 | 19.37 | 15 | p>.05 |
| Marital nonclinical | 70.50 | 27.16 | 128 | |
| Low depression | 74.18 | 25.97 | 365 | p>.05 |
| High depression | 73.71 | 24.68 | 42 | |

Appendix O

Descriptive Data on the New Mother's Activity Checklist Factors by Distressed Status

| Factor | M | SD | n | Sign. Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pleasant Events | | | | |
| Child clinical | 67.42 | 11.43 | 45 | p<.01 |
| Child nonclinical | 72.24 | 12.62 | 526 | |
| Marital clinical | 60.46 | 8.78 | 15 | p<.0002 |
| Marital nonclinical | 72.49 | 11.55 | 128 | |
| Low depression | 71.95 | 12.61 | 365 | p<.0001 |
| High depression | 63.33 | 10.33 | 42 | |
| Aversive Child Behavior | | | | |
| Child clinical | 24.75 | 6.26 | 45 | p<.0001 |
| Child nonclinical | 16.96 | 4.95 | 526 | |
| Marital clinical | 18.26 | 4.02 | 15 | p>.05 |
| Marital nonclinical | 17.00 | 5.57 | 128 | |
| Low depression | 17.33 | 5.23 | 365 | p<.0001 |
| High depression | 20.90 | 4.90 | 42 | |
| Aversive Marital Events | | | | |
| Child clinical | 13.25 | 4.94 | 35 | p<.03 |
| Child nonclinical | 11.61 | 4.23 | 415 | |
| Marital clinical | 14.63 | 6.42 | 11 | p<.0001 |
| Marital nonclinical | 9.62 | 3.01 | 127 | |
| Low depression | 11.48 | 4.20 | 290 | p<.0001 |
| High depression | 16.79 | 5.61 | 24 | |
| Unpleasant Events | | | | |
| Child clinical | 22.86 | 5.32 | 45 | p<.0001 |
| Child nonclinical | 19.35 | 5.01 | 526 | |
| Marital clinical | 20.20 | 4.97 | 15 | p>.05 |
| Marital nonclinical | 18.75 | 5.06 | 128 | |
| Low depression | 18.78 | 4.74 | 365 | p<.0001 |
| High depression | 23.57 | 5.07 | 42 | |

Appendix P

## ANOVA Source Tables

### SES by the Frequency of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 3 | 1489.73 | 2.61 | .05 |
| Within Groups | 794 | 569.21 | | |

### SES by the Frequency of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 3 | 413.64 | .89 | .44 |
| Within Groups | 794 | 462.29 | | |

### SES by the Valence of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 3 | 12894.64 | 7.05 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 794 | 1828.51 | | |

### SES by the Valence of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 3 | 364.29 | .55 | .65 |
| Within Groups | 794 | 659.15 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

SES by Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 3 | 105.99 | .66 | .57 |
| Within Groups | 794 | 158.71 | | |

SES by Aversive Child Behavior

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 3 | 20.38 | .60 | .60 |
| Within Groups | 794 | 33.49 | | |

SES by Aversive Marital Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 3 | 54.38 | 2.52 | .06 |
| Within Groups | 639 | 21.54 | | |

SES by Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 3 | 11.22 | .42 | .73 |
| Within Groups | 794 | 26.27 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Maternal Occupation by the Frequency of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 8 | 884.14 | 1.51 | .15 |
| Within Groups | 638 | 585.29 | | |

Maternal Occupation by the Frequency of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 8 | 658.78 | 1.41 | .18 |
| Within Groups | 638 | 465.28 | | |

Maternal Occupation by the Valence of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 8 | 2856.14 | 1.49 | .15 |
| Within Groups | 638 | 1915.54 | | |

Maternal Occupation by the Valence of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 8 | 1813.62 | 2.79 | .005 |
| Within Groups | 638 | 649.19 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Maternal Occupation by Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 8 | 192.99 | 1.18 | .30 |
| Within Groups | 638 | 163.37 | | |

Maternal Occupation by Aversive Child Behavior

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 8 | 60.51 | 1.90 | .06 |
| Within Groups | 638 | 31.73 | | |

Maternal Occupation by Aversive Marital Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 8 | 28.09 | 1.22 | .28 |
| Within Groups | 479 | 22.90 | | |

Maternal Occupation by Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 8 | 47.26 | 1.78 | .07 |
| Within Groups | 638 | 26.54 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Maternal Education by the Frequency of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 1541.69 | 2.68 | .03 |
| Within Groups | 823 | 574.69 | | |

Maternal Education by the Frequency of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 1601.09 | 3.47 | .008 |
| Within Groups | 823 | 460.27 | | |

Maternal Education by the Valence of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 11467.28 | 6.31 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 823 | 1816.75 | | |

Maternal Education by the Valence of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 3255.82 | 5.11 | .0005 |
| Within Groups | 823 | 637.07 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Maternal Education by Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 282.68 | 1.78 | .12 |
| Within Groups | 823 | 158.23 | | |

Maternal Education by Aversive Child Behavior

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 150.36 | 4.54 | .001 |
| Within Groups | 823 | 33.08 | | |

Maternal Education by Aversive Marital Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 41.12 | 1.92 | .10 |
| Within Groups | 649 | 21.39 | | |

Maternal Education by Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 73.50 | 2.85 | .02 |
| Within Groups | 823 | 25.78 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Income by the Frequency of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6 | 2280.42 | 4.00 | .0006 |
| Within Groups | 800 | 569.90 | | |

Income by the Frequency of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6 | 548.48 | 1.17 | .31 |
| Within Groups | 800 | 467.30 | | |

Income by the Valence of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6 | 22526.42 | 13.09 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 800 | 1719.62 | | |

Income by the Valence of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6 | 904.55 | 1.38 | .21 |
| Within Groups | 800 | 654.68 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Income by Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6 | 151.59 | .95 | .45 |
| Within Groups | 800 | 159.42 | | |

Income by Aversive Child Behavior

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6 | 9.35 | .27 | .94 |
| Within Groups | 800 | 34.16 | | |

Income by Aversive Marital Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6 | 61.47 | 2.97 | .007 |
| Within Groups | 628 | 20.64 | | |

Income by Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 6 | 25.51 | .97 | .43 |
| Within Groups | 800 | 26.13 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Race by the Frequency of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 40.96 | .07 | .79 |
| Within Groups | 812 | 577.12 | | |

Race by the Frequency of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 2691.22 | 5.84 | .02 |
| Within Groups | 812 | 460.45 | | |

Race by the Valence of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 21590.07 | 11.65 | .0007 |
| Within Groups | 812 | 1851.89 | | |

Race by the Valence of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1463.15 | 2.21 | .13 |
| Within Groups | 812 | 649.33 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Race by Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 2109.52 | 13.52 | .0003 |
| Within Groups | 812 | 155.96 | | |

Race by Aversive Child Behavior

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 265.94 | 8.04 | .004 |
| Within Groups | 812 | 33.03 | | |

Race by Aversive Marital Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 22.76 | 1.05 | .31 |
| Within Groups | 642 | 21.59 | | |

Race by Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 109.14 | 4.21 | .04 |
| Within Groups | 812 | 25.90 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Marital Status by the Frequency of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 8827.84 | 16.36 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 828 | 539.54 | | |

Marital Status by the Frequency of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 4946.91 | 11.17 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 828 | 442.79 | | |

Marital Status by the Valence of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 44997.79 | 27.01 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 828 | 1665.78 | | |

Marital Status by the Valence of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 1849.87 | 2.86 | .02 |
| Within Groups | 828 | 644.96 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Marital Status by Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 384.66 | 2.44 | .04 |
| Within Groups | 828 | 157.52 | | |

Marital Status by Aversive Child Behavior

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 31.12 | .92 | .44 |
| Within Groups | 828 | 33.52 | | |

Marital Status by Aversive Marital Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 7.03 | .32 | .56 |
| Within Groups | 654 | 21.49 | | |

Marital Status by Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 4 | 40.28 | 1.54 | .18 |
| Within Groups | 828 | 25.99 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Child Clinical by the Frequency of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 3271.33 | 5.48 | .02 |
| Within Groups | 569 | 596.46 | | |

Child Clinical by the Frequency of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 26026.14 | 62.89 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 569 | 413.83 | | |

Child Clinical by the Valence of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 17873.99 | 9.78 | .002 |
| Within Groups | 569 | 1826.45 | | |

Child Clinical by the Valence of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 31.23 | .04 | .83 |
| Within Groups | 569 | 691.53 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Child Clinical by Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 962.75 | 6.12 | .01 |
| Within Groups | 569 | 157.15 | | |

Child Clinical by Aversive Child Behavior

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 2512.97 | 97.88 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 569 | 25.67 | | |

Child Clinical by Aversive Marital Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 87.09 | 4.71 | .03 |
| Within Groups | 448 | 18.46 | | |

Child Clinical by Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 510.49 | 20.12 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 569 | 25.36 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Marital Clinical by the Frequency of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 12146.93 | 24.46 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 469.49 | | |

Marital Clinical by the Frequency of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1577.12 | 3.88 | .051 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 406.37 | | |

Marital Clinical by the Valence of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 15472.17 | 8.93 | .003 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 1731.96 | | |

Marital Clinical by the Valence of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1128.20 | 1.60 | .21 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 702.00 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Marital Clinical by Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1941.65 | 15.16 | .0002 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 127.99 | | |

Marital Clinical by Aversive Child Behavior

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 21.27 | .71 | .39 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 29.55 | | |

Marital Clinical by Aversive Marital Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 254.53 | 22.21 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 136 | 11.45 | | |

Marital Clinical by Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 27.92 | 1.09 | .29 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 25.53 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Maternal Depression by the Frequency of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 17821.23 | 31.04 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 405 | 574.08 | | |

Maternal Depression by the Frequency of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 16399.04 | 43.15 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 405 | 380.02 | | |

Maternal Depression by the Valence of Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 86427.72 | 49.98 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 405 | 1729.15 | | |

Maternal Depression by the Valence of Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 8.29 | .01 | .91 |
| Within Groups | 405 | 667.95 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Maternal Depression by Pleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 2802.35 | 18.22 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 405 | 153.77 | | |

Maternal Depression by Aversive Child Behavior

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 478.71 | 17.69 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 405 | 27.05 | | |

Maternal Depression by Aversive Marital Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 642.72 | 33.36 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 312 | 18.72 | | |

Maternal Depression by Unpleasant Events

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 863.43 | 37.74 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 405 | 22.87 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

Eyberg Intensity Scores by Maternal Depression

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 24294.12 | 28.53 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 405 | 956.64 | | |

Eyberg Intensity Scores by Marital Clinical Status

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 3619.70 | 3.72 | .06 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 972.16 | | |

Eyberg Problem Scores by Maternal Depression

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1153.48 | 20.84 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 405 | 55.32 | | |

Eyberg Problem Scores by Marital Clinical Status

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 293.83 | 5.18 | .02 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 56.67 | | |

Appendix P (cont.)

DAS Scores by Child Clinical Status

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 86.30 | .17 | .67 |
| Within Groups | 235 | 490.28 | | |

DAS Scores by Maternal Depression

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 22776.09 | 46.87 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 270 | 485.91 | | |

BDI Scores by Child Clinical Status

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 434.31 | 10.95 | .001 |
| Within Groups | 371 | 39.65 | | |

BDI Scores by Marital Clinical Status

| Source | DF | MS | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1 | 1316.21 | 42.69 | .0001 |
| Within Groups | 141 | 30.82 | | |

# Vita

Linda Merideth Little, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Maurice D. Little, was born in New Orleans, Louisiana on May 14, 1963. In June 1981, she was graduated from Benjamin Franklin High School in New Orleans, Louisiana. Upon completion of high school, Linda entered Tulane University and graduated with Honors in Psychology in May, 1985, receiving her Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology. In August, 1985, Linda entered Louisiana State University to pursue graduate studies in the Clinical Psychology program. She obtained her Masters of Arts degree from Louisiana State University in August, 1988 and completed her clinical internship at the University of Alabama at Birmingham in August 1991.

**DOCTORAL EXAMINATION AND DISSERTATION REPORT**

**Candidate:** Linda M. Little

**Major Field:** Psychology

**Title of Dissertation:** Further Psychometric Properties of the Mother's Activity Checklist

**Approved:**

Mary L. Kelley
**Major Professor and Chairman**

**Dean of the Graduate School**

**EXAMINING COMMITTEE:**

**Date of Examination:**

5/18/92